





SAINT-ÉTIENNE, BEAUVAS

Fullest development of organic Romanesque. The present vaulting is early Gothic.



ROMANESQUE SCULPTURE, WEST FRONT, LINCOLN CATHEDRAL.

### ROMANESQUE ARCHITECTURE.

By Professor CHARLES H. MOORE, A.M. [Hon.A.].

THE term Romanesque, as applied to the church architecture of the eleventh and early twelfth centuries in Western Europe, is a good one in so far as it marks the correspondence of this art with the new idioms of speech that were then growing out of the fusion of races, and which are known as the Romance dialects. But used without discrimination the term is a vague one, since the architecture in question embraces a great variety of types, in some cases differing fundamentally one from another, and of very unequal importance from the point of view of subsequent architectural development.

Quicherat's\* definition of Romanesque as that architecture of the Middle Ages which has ceased to be Roman, though it derives much from the Roman source, and is not yet Gothic, though it has some elements of Gothic,† though profoundly true of one variety of it, is not at all true of Romanesque in general. The French archæologists of the early part of the nineteenth century, who first used the term, took little account of the fundamental differences of types. The common feature of the round arch—which they regarded as distinguishing the Romanesque from the subsequent Gothic style—seemed to them to bring all of this architecture into one category, and such classification of schools as they attempted was based on a minute study and comparison of unessential details. Great misapprehensions thus arose, and a bewildering confusion of ideas has prevailed in consequence. Quicherat, however, writing in 1851, brought some order into this confusion by seeking the distinctive character of Romanesque, as differentiated from Roman, in structural analysis; and his classification of Romanesque types is based on such analysis.‡ He remarks on the futility of looking for the essential traits of Romanesque

\* Jules Quicherat, *De l'Architecture Romane*, in the *Mélanges d'Archéologie et d'Histoire*, edited by M. de Lasticry, Paris: 1886, tome II. *Moyen Age*.

† *Ibid.* p. 88.

‡ It is worthy of notice that the English writer, Willis, preceded Quicherat in recognising the primary importance of construction in architectural studies. In the preface to his *Architecture of the Middle Ages* (London, 1835), p. 5, he

architecture in mere details, and says of the earlier archæologists : " Ils énumèrent les façons données aux pierres, mesurent leurs faces, dissertent sur les mortiers qui les relient ; ils vous décrivent les moulures, les modillons, les feuillages appliqués sur les bandeaux des frises et aux chapiteaux des colonnes ; poussent même la minutie dans cette dernière étude, jusqu'à en faire une botanique à eux qu'ils appellent la *Flore Murale*. Mais de tous ces traits si laborieusement recueillis ne résulte pas la physionomie du genre ; car . . . ." \* Then follow some remarks in which he maintains that these details differ from those of ancient Roman art only in being rude and imperfect, wherefore, he thinks, they cannot be called distinctively Romanesque. He overlooks here the marked Byzantine elements that are present, and the new spirit that is largely recreating the ancient motives. As to the fundamental characteristics of Romanesque, he strikes solid ground in saying that what chiefly constitutes this art " n'est qu'une manière d'être particulière de la construction et dont en définitive le caractère ne peut tenir qu'aux dispositions fondamentales des édifices, aux lois d'après lesquelles les pleins et les vides s'y montrent combinés ; de même que les caractères distinctifs des espèces animales résident dans la structure des corps et non dans le tissu des organes." † But while he shows a keen appreciation of logical organic composition, he fails to emphasise the difference between buildings which show this and those that have little, or none at all, of this character. His analysis of structural forms is, for the most part, just, as far as it goes. He perceives that the forms and adjustments of supports in vaulted buildings have their rise in the exigencies of vaulting, but he fails to notice how rarely a logical system is fully carried out, and how numerous are the instances of organic misadjustment. He does not see that of the manifold types of Romanesque only that in which groined vaulting is associated with a growing organic relationship of structural parts, extending through the whole building, can be properly called transitional in the sense of his own definition of Romanesque as an art developing into Gothic. And when he says : " Le trait essentiel du genre roman . . . c'est la voûte," ‡ he overlooks the fact that a great deal of Romanesque architecture is unvaulted, and shows no consistent intention of vaulting. Thus, notwithstanding that he did much to put the study of this subject on a right basis, he did not fully clarify it. He gives a lucid analysis of different types of Romanesque, but by lumping them all together as transitional he leaves us in confusion.

Choisy, § like Quicherat, lumps Romanesque all together, and says of it : " presque toutes sont des églises monastiques. Œuvres de pure imitation, quelques-unes reproduisaient des plans byzantins ; la plupart répondaient simplement au type de la basilique latine." || Then of the architecture of the Middle Ages in general he says : " Il a deux âges bien distincts : un âge de formation par voie d'emprunt, auquel on a très justement donné le nom même qui désigne les langues nouvelles dont il est contemporain, l'âge roman ; puis l'âge d'originalité absolue, l'âge analytique au plus haut point, auquel on attribue le nom impropre mais consacré de gothique. De l'un à l'autre il n'existe point d'interruption : l'un marque l'aspiration méthodique, l'autre le résultat acquis." ¶

Thus the confusion becomes worse confounded. Where Quicherat finds Romanesque an art of transition, Choisy considers it an art of pure imitation, following, for the most part, the basilican model. But the writer is here strangely inconsistent. If the works of the two periods into which he divides the architecture of the Middle Ages are, as he tells us, wholly distinct, how can it be said that between them there is no break ; and how can the one be an architecture of formation if the other is an art of absolute originality ?

lays stress on what he calls " the distinction between the Decorative and Mechanical structures of buildings," and in all his works he concerns himself primarily with construction.

\* *Architecture of the Middle Ages*, p. 89.

† *Ibid.* p. 90.

‡ *Ibid.* p. 101.

§ Auguste Choisy, *Histoire de l'Architecture*, Paris, 1899.

|| *Ibid.* tome II, p. 139.

¶ *Ibid.* p. 140.

Viollet-le-Duc, whose knowledge of construction and of structural evolution in architecture is unequalled by that of any other writer thus far, does not include the word Romane as the heading of an article in the *Dictionnaire*; but he uses it freely in many parts of the work. Like the foregoing writers he calls all mediaeval architecture in the West Romanesque, except the Gothic. But in developing the evolution of the Gothic style he finds its elements in the groin vaulted variety only. Thus he does not, like Quicherat, make Romanesque in general a transitional art.

Let us seek a clearer understanding of Romanesque architecture, more particularly of that variety of it which was quick with the germs of Gothic development. It is important to bear in mind that the elements out of which this multiform art arose were derived from various sources where they had been shaped, respectively, under widely differing conditions. They were not, as Quicherat in his definition implies, merely Roman elements,\* though the Christian Roman basilica naturally gave the model for the primitive churches in all parts of Europe. In church building, as in all else, Rome was conservative. Throughout the Middle Ages nothing happened there to greatly disturb the local building traditions. The city was never held for any length of time under barbarian rule, † and as the Roman Church held sway over Western Christendom, there naturally went forth continuously from Rome to the remotest provinces of the West, together with the authoritative ecclesiastical system, a practically uniform influence in church building. Thus the basilican idea was established and long remained dominant.

But that diversity should arise, even in basilican architecture, was inevitable under the conditions that prevailed. In Italy, where traditions were strong and ancient monuments from which members and materials could be had were abundant, the churches had a degree of elegance, and even of classic character, that could not be attained elsewhere. In the northern provinces, on the other hand, models and materials were lacking, and thus in those localities ruder forms of basilican structures arose. In considering the varieties of Romanesque architecture with a view to discover, in any given case, the extent to which the basilican idea prevails, it should be kept in mind that the constant characteristics of basilican building are timber roofs, save for the half-dome vault over the apse, supported on relatively thin walls and continuous arcades or colonnades, without any buttressing features.

But in Rome, side by side with the basilicas, though much less frequently, and chiefly for baptisteries, buildings circular or polygonal on plan were erected. These are in some cases purely basilican in principle of construction, as the Baptistry of S. Giovanni Laterano, while others, as the round church or tomb of Sta. Constantia, are vaulted with a hemispherical dome over the central area, and an annular barrel-vault over the concentric aisle. These Roman forms, but chiefly that of rectangular plan, were primarily influential in the West wherever churches were built.

A secondary influence, however, came from Byzantium, and began to act on the architecture of the West during the Carlovingian epoch. The beginnings of the noble Byzantine art, which assumed its distinctive character in the sixth century, are obscure. But it appears to have grown mainly out of a creative fusion of Roman and Eastern elements under the quickening power of the Byzantine Greek genius, which the stimulating conditions following the transference of the seat of empire seem to have awakened into renewed life.

The Byzantine structure differs greatly from the basilican in being vaulted throughout. This vaulting is of two principal forms—that of the hemispherical dome and that of the domical groined vault. The chief peculiarity of the Byzantine structural system consists in the adjustment of the circular dome to a square area by means of pendentives, or spherical triangles of

\* It is fair to say that later on he recognises the Byzantine and other elements.

romaine." Guizot, *Hist. de la Civilisation en France*, edition of 1884, vol. ii, p. 307.

† "Seule, elle resta romaine après la ruine de l'Empire

masonry, one in each angle of the square, which give the circular bed on which the dome rests. Pendentives are found in a few instances in Roman buildings of polygonal plan, as in the so-called temple of Minerva Medica. But they never became characteristic of Roman building, and were never used in Rome with the hardihood displayed by the Byzantine constructors. In Byzantine architecture, as in no other, it became the most distinctive structural feature.

But while the dome on pendentives is the most essential feature of the Byzantine style, it is not the most important from the point of view of subsequent vault development in Western Europe. Placed over the crossing of nave and transept, it modified, indeed, very conspicuously many forms of Romanesque architecture of basilican plan in the eleventh and twelfth centuries; but its influence was not nearly so great and recreating as that of the domical groined vault. For the dome is incapable of development, since with any essential change of form—as that of breaking it up into cells—it ceases to be a dome.\* But the domical groined vault contained seeds of far-reaching developments. In this vault the groin arch has a semi-circular or segmental curve, and lies in a vertical plane. The crown of this arch, since its span is longer than the spans of the arches on the sides, reaches a higher level, and thus makes the vault domical. The substitution of this form of groin for the elliptical groin of the Roman builders gave a freedom in vault construction before unknown. For whereas before the groined vault could not be shaped to an oblong area without stiltting the narrow-spanned arches, and developing groins sinuous on plan, it could now be adjusted to a rectangle of any proportions with groins straight on plan and without stiltting.

These two traditions, basilican Roman and Byzantine, governed, for the most part, all building in the West during the earlier Middle Ages. But in the north, from the ninth to the eleventh centuries, with the conditions that followed the rise of the new monarchies, and the growth of independent local activities under diverse racial conditions, new features in great variety arose in the architectures of different localities, so that in the eleventh century the varieties of structural forms became so great that the study of them is bewildering until we get some grasp of the broad principles which enable us to classify them, and thus to bring order into the apparent chaos.

With the placing of the dome on pendentives or on squinches, over the crossing of the basilica, the building was made to embody two wholly different older structural systems, neither of which was changed in any essential way, as in the cathedral of Pisa. But where the Germanic races had become dominant and a fusion with the Latin stock had made some progress, architecture began to assume a character essentially different from any that had before been known, and to exhibit in some localities a tendency to a novel sort of organic composition. Here cautious discrimination becomes necessary in order to find a working principle of classification that will enable us to disengage the true organic types from those that are essentially survivals of older forms or that suggest, by their functional inconsistencies, imperfect imitation of genuine organic systems. It appears to me that most of the architecture of the Middle Ages was more or less imitative rather than genuinely creative. There are two kinds of structural imperfection noticeable in many buildings having features that belong to the organic type. The first is that—natural to stages of experimentation—in which the organism is as yet incomplete, and the second is that which betrays unintelligent copying. The first does not violate reason, but the second is known by its manifold inconsistencies.

It is now commonly recognised that the new features that differentiate the architecture of the eleventh century from the purely basilican style, arose out of the exigencies of vaulting over naves. But it is not so clearly seen that the various forms of vaulting in use at that time

\* Cf. my *Character of Renaissance Architecture*, pp. 56-59.

were not equally conducive to the growth of that peculiar structural system which characterises the really organic Romanesque art. The barrel vault, for instance, so extensively used in the churches of Southern Gaul, could hardly have given rise to the logically compound support that we find in these churches. For while the transverse ribs with which some of these vaults are furnished give a reason for separate supporting members, the ribs themselves arise from no structural necessity, as is shown by the numerous barrel-vaulted naves where, as in the church of Notre Dame du Port, Clermont, no ribs occur. A barrel vault is a continuous arch, and is secure at every point in its length if it be properly abutted. Therefore a transverse rib has no such function in a barrel vault as it has between adjoining compartments of groined vaulting. Neither the ribs, their supports, nor the isolated buttresses are necessary in barrel-vaulted structures. The buttressing of such vaults, to be logical and effective, ought to be continuous, since the thrusts are equal at all points. Thus Viollet-le-Duc remarks : "La poussée continue de ce genre de voûtes les fit bientôt abandonner." \*

The use of barrel vaults over naves was natural with the builders of Southern Gaul, where the ancient Roman civilisation had long flourished, where barrel-vaulted Roman structures had survived, and where Roman institutions and ideas had been largely maintained. † Thus when the great mediæval revival of building set in it was not unnatural that the ancient models should here have been followed. And since in some of the local ancient vaults salient transverse ribs were found, as in the aisle of the amphitheatre at Nîmes, it was equally natural that these too should be copied. But for the compound supports, above mentioned, the ancient monuments furnished no models, and it appears to me probable that they were derived from the Lombard side of the Alps, where such supports were taking form as early as the tenth century. ‡

It is not, then, to these barrel-vaulted structures, based as they are on an ancient system that contained no seeds of growth—for of all forms of vaulting the barrel vault lends itself least to organic development—that we should look for the beginnings of the progressive building of the Middle Ages. An architecture so different as this progressive style is from any that the genius of the ancients had produced would not be likely to arise where the ancient ideas had remained so dominant as they had in Southern Gaul. But new developments would appear natural where the fresh spirit of the Northern genius had become active. It is accordingly in North Italy and in Northern Gaul that we find the earliest instances of structural innovation, and a comparative study of the monuments of these two regions appears to me to point to North Italy as the seat of the first inventive developments.

Although no architecture of a new character, dating from the time of the Lombard occupation, could be looked for in the nature of things—since it would necessarily take time for the barbarian spirit to make itself felt in works of art—there is every evidence that the native genius of this region was profoundly modified by the Lombard sojourn, so that the genius of the mixed race, after it had had time to mature, would find expression in new modes of design. And when we consider that the so-called Lombard Romanesque architecture, as we find it in the vaulted nave of St. Ambrogio of Milan, has a character radically different from the native Italian basilican style and from any other previous style, it would seem clear that it must have been due to a creative impulse imparted by the Northern people. It is, however, maintained by some recent writers that the ribbed groined vault, § the generating feature of St. Ambrogio, was not of Lombard origin. The latest advocate of this view is the distinguished French archaeologist, M. le Comte de Lasteyrie, who in his copious and valuable work, *L'Architecture Religieuse*

\* *Dictionnaire, &c.*, s.v. Voûte, p. 500.

† "La Gaule était située sur la limite du monde romain et du monde germanique. Le Midi de la Gaule a été essentiellement romain, le nord essentiellement germanique." Guizot, *Hist. de la Civilisation en France*, tome I. p. 36.

‡ Cf. Cattaneo, *L'Architettura in Italia dal Secolo VI al Mille Circa*, Venice, 1889, p. 228 *et seq.*

§ This is a long name for a vault, but nothing shorter will express with precision what is meant.

*en France à l'Epoque Romane*,\* affirms emphatically that the use of the groin rib was a spontaneous French invention, basing the affirmation on what he believes to be the dates, respectively, of the earliest Lombard and the French vaults with groin ribs. It will be worth while briefly to consider his argument. After discussing the view of Quicherat, who derived the groin ribs from a Roman source, and concluding that he was mistaken, he remarks : " Il est donc infiniment plus vraisemblable que l'idée de la croisée d'ogives leur est venue spontanément comme une conséquence naturelle des principes qu'ils [the French] appliquaient dans leurs constructions. L'ogive est, en effet, à la voûte d'arêtes, ce que le doubleau est à la voûte en berceau ; il est tout simple que des architectes, frappés du secours qu'ils trouvaient dans les doubleaux, aient cherché dans les ogives un secours analogue pour la construction des voûtes d'arêtes. Je n'hésite donc pas à considérer la croisée d'ogives comme une invention spontanée des architectes français de la fin du XI<sup>e</sup> siècle. Je dis *français*, car, s'il a pu y avoir jadis quelque doute à cet égard, on ne conteste plus guère aujourd'hui à notre pays la paternité de cette invention. L'Italie y a prétendu pendant longtemps, et il s'est trouvé, même en France, des auteurs pour attribuer aux croisées d'ogives que l'on voit à Saint-Ambroise de Milan, à Saint-Michel de Pavie et dans quelques autres édifices de la Lombardie, une antériorité marquée sur les plus vieilles ogives de France." † In reply to this it may be said (1) that what is thought to be *plus vraisemblable* does not, of course, justify an unqualified affirmation, and that the argument by which the author seeks to fortify his opinion is unsound, for (2) it is incorrect to say that the groin rib is to the groined vault what the transverse rib is to the barrel vault. The function of the groin rib is to strengthen a part of the groined vault that is weaker than the rest, but in the barrel vault no part is weaker than another ; and although it may be possible that the use of the transverse rib in the barrel vault might suggest the use of the groin rib in the groined vault, I do not think it would be likely to do so. (3) The question of priority as between the Lombard use of the groin rib and that of the French builders is hardly disposed of by the author's remarks here, nor by his further argument as follows : " Mais ce sont des idées qu'il n'est plus possible de soutenir aujourd'hui, car il n'est pas douteux que Saint-Michel de Pavie n'ait été rebâtie de fond en comble à la suite du terrible tremblement de terre qui détruisit la ville en 1127." For confirmation of this he cites Cattaneo, but all that this writer says in the passage referred to is that in his belief San Michele " sorgesce appunto nel principio del Secolo XII, e forse dopo il famoso terremoto del 1127." ‡ This is hardly a demonstration, and to say that the rebuilding was *perhaps* after the earthquake does not justify M. de Lasteyrie's emphatic affirmation that it was. It may, however, very well be true that what remains of the Lombard nave of this church is a work of the early years of the twelfth century. M. de Lasteyrie continues : " Quant à Saint-Ambroise de Milan, ses voûtes sont loin d'avoir l'antiquité qu'on leur a prêtée. Cattaneo a montré avec une grande force de raisonnement que la seule partie de l'église remontant aux temps carolingiens était l'extrême-orientale de l'édifice. . . . Il admettait que la nef avait pu recevoir sa forme actuelle avant le dernier quart du XI<sup>e</sup> siècle, mais ses voûtes, si elles existaient dès cette époque, avaient dû être refaites depuis, car elles étaient assez mal construites pour qu'une partie d'entre elles se soient écroulées dans les dernières années du XII<sup>e</sup> siècle." The remark about the east end is irrelevant, since that part of the building is not in question, and it is well known that it is a part of an earlier edifice, built in the ninth century under the pontificate of Archbishop Angilberto. The part with which we are concerned is the groin-vaulted nave, and if this part had its present form, as Cattaneo supposes, before the last quarter of the eleventh century—however much the vaulting may have been damaged and repaired later—then the priority of the Lombard use of the groin rib, and the complete organic system with which it is

\* Paris, Alphonse Picard et Fils, 1912.

† *Op. cit.* p. 259.

‡ Cf. Cattaneo, *op. cit.* p. 211 (footnote).

connected, would seem to be established, for nobody supposes that there was anything of the kind elsewhere in Europe at that time.

M. de Lasteyrie appears illogical in his further argument also. After referring to certain documents lately brought to notice by Sig. Biscaro, he says : " M. Biscaro a conclu de ces documents que la reconstruction de Saint-Ambroise avait eu lieu de 1098 à 1145 environ," and on the strength of this he affirms that the vaults of the nave " ne sont pas antérieures de beaucoup au milieu du XII<sup>e</sup> siècle et à la construction des voûtes de Saint-Denys." This is not a fair deduction from the passage quoted, for if the work was begun, as Sig. Biscaro holds, in 1098, then it is, in idea at least, a work of the eleventh century, and a great part, if not all, of it would naturally have been built in the early years of the twelfth century. But however this may be, to take the date of completion of a work begun half a century before, and maintain that the system embodied in it had not arisen before that date, is to disregard reason.

With reference to St. Denis M. de Lasteyrie remarks that its vaults " ne sont sûrement pas le coup d'essai des architectes français. Elles sont aussi habilement combinées que celles de Saint-Ambroise le sont peu, et l'on ne saurait douter que le pays qui les vit éléver de 1140 à 1144, n'ait été le théâtre de bien des essais et de tâtonnements avant d'arriver à un pareil résultat." But this reasoning applies equally to St. Ambrogio. There can be no doubt that there were many earlier experiments in organic vaulted building in Lombardy, and remains embodying some of these are extant.

In a footnote M. de Lasteyrie remarks that Sig. Rivoira\* has lately admitted the reconstruction of St. Ambrogio in the twelfth century. But reconstruction does not affect the question so long as the first building is admitted to have been begun in the same form. If the work was begun on these lines in 1098 it is clearly, as I have said, an eleventh-century idea ; for in such a system the whole is necessarily foreseen and provided for from the beginning. From the moment when the piers were set out there could, from their forms, be no question that the entire organism, as we behold it, was intended. In his zeal to establish a French origin for the groin rib M. de Lasteyrie has made affirmations which the facts, so far as they are known, and even as he states them, do not warrant.

Bearing in mind that it is not the groin rib alone that should concern us but the whole system to which ribbed groin vaulting logically gives rise, let us now consider the system of St. Ambrogio, † and compare it with such other early systems as we may find.

The first striking feature of the vaulting of St. Ambrogio is a system of salient ribs, including groin ribs. All of these ribs are semi-circular, or nearly so, and since the diagonals have longer spans than the ribs on the sides of the compartments, they reach a higher level, and thus give the vault a domical form, like that of the Byzantine vault already considered. These ribs form a strong skeleton on which the vaults are turned, and constitute the first step in the transformation of the Byzantine vault into the Gothic vault.‡ For this rib skeleton the piers make perfect provision, the transverse rib having for its support a pilaster strip rising from the pavement, the groin ribs having each an engaged column, and the longitudinal rib springing from a rectangular member rising from the ground story impost. The aisles, being about half the width of the nave, are in each bay divided into two parts by a smaller pier and a transverse arch, so that there are two compartments of aisle vaulting to one compartment in the nave. Thus is developed an alternate system of piers which, with many variations of proportions and details, are often met with in the subsequent Romanesque buildings of many parts of Europe. The

\* *Le Origini della Architettura Lombarda, &c.*, Rome, 1907, p. 260.

† I have twice before had occasion to describe St. Ambrogio, first in my *Development and Character of Gothic Architecture*, second edition, p. 36 *et seq.*, and again in my

*Medieval Church Architecture of England*, p. 26 *et seq.*

‡ I do not affirm that this first step was first taken here, nor even that it was first taken in Lombardy, though such evidence as we have appears to me to point to this conclusion.

smaller pier of St. Ambrogio, having no part in the support of the high vaulting, does not rise above the ground story impost, but is logically composed in conformity with the arches that spring from it, namely, the great double archivolts and the transverse rib of the aisle vaulting. Since the aisle vaults have no groin ribs, no secondary members occur on the aisle side; there is, however, a small colonnette rising from the capital of this lesser pier to the level of the triforium string, which has nothing to carry, and no apparent reason for being. St. Ambrogio has no clerestory, but what I have just called a triforium is a vaulted gallery, and the double archivolts of this gallery are carried on short compound supports corresponding to those below. Externally the system is reinforced by plain rectangular buttresses set against cross walls over the gallery. It is worthy of notice, too, that the logic of the system is carried out in the bases and capitals—those that carry the groin ribs being set obliquely in conformity with the directions of those ribs.

I know of no equally logical organic vaulted system north of the Alps until we come to the church of St. Etienne of Beauvais, which can hardly have been begun before the end of the first decade of the twelfth century,\* to which time the easternmost bay may, I think, be pretty safely assigned. This easternmost bay shows the original system intact,† except the high vaulting, which was rebuilt after a fire that damaged the building in the year 1180. The system is not so complete as that of St. Ambrogio, since there is no member in the pier for the support of a longitudinal rib. The longitudinal rib is, in fact, frequently wanting in the early twelfth century vaulting of the Ile de France. But apart from this St. Etienne is remarkable for logical organic composition, having independent supports from the pavement for the transverse ribs and groin ribs, and the bases and capitals of these last set obliquely as in St. Ambrogio. The composition as a whole is very plain, and although it has a clerestory, there are, in this earliest bay, no triforium openings. The system of St. Etienne is uniform, and differs greatly from St. Ambrogio in its proportions, as well as in the style of its details; but in structural principle the two are alike, though St. Etienne is in advance of St. Ambrogio in having the domical ribbed groined vault applied to oblong areas, and in having groin ribs in the aisle vaults as well as in those of the nave. St. Ambrogio of Milan and St. Etienne of Beauvais are, I believe, the only Romanesque buildings dating from before the second half of the twelfth century, now extant in Europe, that show, substantially intact, a logical organic system for vaulting with groin ribs. In the nave of Vézelay we find, indeed, a logical scheme, but its vaulting is not furnished with groin ribs, and the pier is correspondingly imperfect in development. In the Ile de France, from the first quarter of the twelfth century, the air was quick with the spirit of invention, so that buildings like St. Germer de Fly, although classed by Quicherat and de Lasteyrie as Romanesque, are really advanced transitional Gothic, notwithstanding the survival in them of some very primitive Romanesque features.

No French province in the eleventh and early twelfth centuries showed more vigorous building activity than that of Normandy, and most of the churches here have many features that belong to an organic system; but I do not know of one dating from before the latter part of the twelfth century that is logically composed for high vaulting on groin ribs. There was no vaulting of naves in the early churches of this province, but in a few cases, as in the Abbaye-aux-Dames of Caen, plain groined vaults were built over short choirs—where the arms of the transept and flanking turrets gave strong abutment—soon after the middle of the eleventh century. There are two compartments of such vaulting in the Abbaye-aux-Dames.‡ Yet

\* The nave of St. Etienne is commonly held to date from about 1130, but the easternmost bay appears considerably older, and it is to this part that I refer.

† The system of the nave of St. Etienne, including this earliest bay, is figured in my *Development and Character of*

*Gothic Architecture*, second edition, p. 105.

‡ They are shaped essentially on the Roman model, and are separated by a heavy transverse rib of one order, carried on a half-round shaft engaged with a pilaster.

few large churches in Normandy are without vaulting shafts incorporated with their piers. These shafts are, however, in most cases, carried up to the top of the wall, where vaulting could not spring.\* Apart from vaulting such members have no functional propriety. They may, indeed, be made to carry the trusses of a timber roof, but such a roof does not require them, as is shown by all basilican structures. In these Norman works they are illogical.

It is worthy of notice that we find in the Norman Romanesque many instances of that alternate system that we have found in St. Ambrogio of Milan and some other Lombard churches. What remains of the great abbey church of Jumièges, dating from the middle of the eleventh century, and thus much earlier than St. Ambrogio, exhibits this system. To those who believe that the Norman art was in advance of that of Lombardy this may appear a demonstration of truth in their position. I do not, however, think that it is, though I am unable to point to any buildings with these alternate supports of so early date in Lombardy. For in the unvaulted Norman work such a system has no reason for being, and it would therefore hardly seem likely to be original. In vaulted architecture such an arrangement of supports grows out of the exigencies of vaulting where a great vault in the nave embraces two smaller vaults in the aisles as we have seen in the case of St. Ambrogio. There is obviously no occasion for it where there is no nave vaulting, unless it be supposed that the great shafts with which the larger piers are furnished carried cross-walls on transverse arches dividing the timber roof into compartments. This may very well have been the case,† and it would account for the buttresses that we find against the clerestory wall. It would, too, make the system logical, but it would take it out of the category of buildings advancing along the lines of vault development and what grows out of it in organic construction. However this may be, that the alternate systems of Jumièges and other Norman monuments were due to an influence transmitted from the Lombard source—where like systems were developed with such admirable logic in vaulted structures—appears to me the only reasonable inference from the monuments themselves. For in the Romanesque of Lombardy we have an art advancing on organic lines, while in Normandy there is little evidence of consistent organic development. Nor is the fact, if it be a fact, that no extant Lombard buildings embodying such a system are of so early date as the earlier Norman examples, any conclusive evidence of Norman priority. For it stands to reason that such a scheme as that of St. Ambrogio could not have been, to use M. de Lastic's phrase in regard to St. Denis, a *coup d'essai*. There must, as I have said, have been earlier trials along the same lines.

The supposition that the Lombard structures were derived from Normandy appears to me to violate reason since, as I have elsewhere said,‡ it assumes that a logical system could be derived from an illogical one, and ignores the known influences that would naturally work in an opposite direction. The settlement in Normandy in the eleventh century of such native Lombards as Lanfranc and Anselm at the head, successively, of a great monastic house, habituated as we know such men were to active participation in the planning and erection of buildings, could hardly fail to have strong influence on the forming local art. Lanfranc had come to the Abbey of Bec in the year 1042, and thus before the church of Jumièges was begun, which seems to me, in itself, almost a demonstration that the alternate system of this church—the first, I

\* Cf. my *Mediæval Church Architecture of England*, pp. 2-4.

† The walls are still standing, and there are scars on them, over the shafts, which may either be from such cross walls, or from the shafts themselves if they were formerly carried up to the top of the wall in the common Norman manner. The shafts now reach no higher than the sills of the clerestory openings, a level from which either arches or vaulting might spring; but they could not have carried vaults in square compartments—which the system would call for—since the large clerestory openings are so placed

that vaulting arches would have crossed them. But there are indications of possible later vaulting in a different form. The capitals which still crown these shafts on the north side are of Gothic character, and between them, at the same level, the wall is broken in the middle of each double bay in a way that suggests the possibility that corbels were once inserted from which, together with the shafts, vaulting in narrow oblong compartments may have sprung. Such vaulting, if much stilted, might clear the clerestory lights. But no remains of vaulting appear.

‡ *Ibid.* p. 26 (footnote).

believe, in Normandy to have such a system—was derived from the Lombard source. Rude and uninstructed as the primitive Norman builders must necessarily have been, it stands to reason that they would be open to such architectural ideas as they could grasp from a source where the practice of architecture had long been going on under conditions far more favourable to inventive progress than any that could then have prevailed in Normandy. In borrowing features from the Lombard art it would seem natural that the inexperienced Normans would largely fail to comprehend their consistent use in that organic structural composition which had been in course of development in Lombardy since the tenth century. They did not see that in their unvaulted naves they had no proper use for these features, and in introducing them they committed, as we have seen, many structural solecisms.

In the foregoing remarks I have confined myself in each building considered to the main system almost exclusively, because here the fundamental characteristics and essential differences of styles appear, and because the analysis and comparative study of structural forms have been too much neglected in discussions on mediaeval architecture. I have said little about general planning, and such features as towers, artistic proportions and groupings of parts, or of ornamental details, not only because the essentials of architectural styles do not primarily reside in them, but also because these things are already largely set forth in many books.

The study of mediæval architecture from æsthetic feeling, without proper reference to the structural basis of the art, is now giving place to a more fruitful study based on examination of structural forms. Writers are at present much occupied with ribbed vaulting, and many hitherto little-noticed examples of such vaulting are being brought to light. This is well, but as yet too little discrimination is shown in the discussions of them. The term *croisée d'ogives* appears with almost tiresome frequency in many contemporaneous French writings, but few writers have enough considered how little significance the mere presence of the groin rib may have from the point of view of an advancing art. The degree of importance attaching to it depends on the manner in which it is used. In the crypt of Gloucester Cathedral, for instance, are Norman vaults to which groin ribs appear to have been added at a time subsequent to that of the original construction. The ribs in this case have no significance in connection with vault development, since they do not shape the vault but are shaped by it. Again, in the aisles of Peterborough are vaults with groin ribs which are parts of the first construction, but they are without importance in the development of vaulting, since they are used imitatively and awkwardly, while the conformation of the vault retains as much as possible of the form of primitive groined vaulting. It is only when groin ribs are so shaped and adjusted as to determine, together with the other ribs, the form of the vault, and are supplemented by corresponding supports, that they have important significance. It is the tendency to a complete organic system, of which the ribbed groined vault is the generating feature, that marks the progressive type of Romanesque building. This type is developed, I believe, in the Lombard Romanesque and the organic Romanesque\* of the Ile de France only. There are many buildings of the eleventh and twelfth centuries in different parts of Europe in which the organic idea, while it shapes some of the parts, is but partly or imperfectly developed. The Rhenish Romanesque churches furnish notable instances of this. In the cathedral of Speyer, for instance, the groin rib itself is wanting, and although the longitudinal rib is present, it is provided with no supporting member in the pier. Such buildings, wherever they are found, appear to me to show imitation without proper grasp of the organic principle.

A discriminating examination of what is commonly known as the Romanesque architecture of the Middle Ages shows, then, that (apart from the barrel-vaulted structures of Southern

\* There was much basilican Romanesque, and other backward Romanesque, in the Ile de France, as well as in other regions; and little of the strictly organic type survived the vigorous early Gothic movement.

Gaul, and the dome-vaulted buildings on the Byzantine model of the Périgord) the many forms of it are broadly reducible to the two types of unvaulted basilican and vaulted organic structures, or structures having some organic features. But it shows also that few of them are either purely basilican or consistently organic. The basilican structure is in many cases, as we have seen, modified by some form of vault or tower over the crossing, giving rise to massive supporting piers of variously compound form (and sometimes to an almost entirely vaulted east end) by altered proportions, by structural details that have lost all Roman character, and by ornamentation almost equally removed from that of Roman art though based on Roman motives. Take, for example, the nave of Vignory (Haute-Marne), a distinctly basilican structure dating from early in the eleventh century. But in the general character and expression of its proportions and details it differs greatly from a Roman basilican church. In this northern province there were no remains of older buildings from which capitals, columns, and other members could, as in Italy, be gathered. The rude workmen were obliged to construct piers of rough masonry for the ground story supports, though in the openings of the simulated triforium (there is no gallery over the aisle, but the aisle roof is as high as that of such a gallery would be) twin arches are supported in the middle on short colonnettes which so differ one from another in their proportions, some of them, too, having entasis, as to indicate that they are fragments from distant older buildings. The capitals of these colonnettes, of great variety and of rudely Byzantine character, were probably also brought from a distance. These features, together with the massive construction and taller proportions, give the interior an aspect very unlike that of a Roman basilican church; while the east end, save for the spherical half-dome vault of the apse, has no basilican character whatever. The crossing arch, of two heavy orders, is carried on compound piers, and a barrel-vaulted apsidal aisle has three small half-dome vaulted apses opening out of it. Thus, with endless variety, were basilican churches north of the Alps more or less changed in character and aspect.

Of the organic type, as we have seen, few are completely so, and the larger number can be included in the organic category only because features of an organic system are more or less freely used in them, and no parts retain the purely basilican structural forms. In such buildings vaulting members are either not used at all for vaulting or they are used without structural propriety.

In ornamental details, as wall arcades, the archivolts and jambs of portals and window openings, profilings, foliation and fretwork, all kinds of Romanesque are for the most part much the same. Of the many varieties of such details almost any may be found in any class of Romanesque buildings, and thus it is that so long as the study of mediæval architecture continued to concern itself mainly with these details there could be little understanding of the essential differences of styles.

The varieties of Romanesque, distinguished by their structural forms, may be broadly grouped under the five following heads: (1) The Basilican Romanesque; (2) The Organic Vaulted Romanesque; (3) The Imperfectly Organic Romanesque; (4) The Barrel-Vaulted Romanesque; (5) The Dome-Vaulted Romanesque.

Most of these groups might, however, be almost indefinitely subdivided. The Basilican Romanesque, for instance, assumes many different forms, especially in the parts that are vaulted. The Organic Romanesque divides broadly into uniform and alternate systems. The Imperfectly Organic Romanesque has vaulted and unvaulted types. The Barrel-Vaulted Romanesque presents a great variety of forms. It comprises buildings with high aisle vaults, giving abutment to the central vault, but making a dark nave; and those with low aisles, giving a clerestory. This last, however, is vicious in principle since it leaves the high vault without abutment. The barrel-vaulted structures further subdivide into those in which the vault is of round section,

and those in the form of the pointed arch ; and again into vaults having salient ribs, and those without such ribs. And still further we find barrel-vaulted naves with groin-vaulted aisles, as in *Notre Dame la Grande*, Poitiers. The dome-vaulted Romanesque is almost equally various, including domes of spherical form and those of ovoid, or of pointed outline. The forms of pendentive arches divide also into those which are semi-circular and those which are pointed. In another division we get domes with which the pendentives are continuous, as at Fontevraud ; in still others the same form of vault has ribs on its surface, including diagonal ribs like the groin ribs of groined vaulting, as at Saumur. There are also some buildings of a logical, though not progressive, organic character, in which ribbed vaults are made so domical that groins are but slightly developed in them, as at Angers.

The basilican, the barrel-vaulted, and the dome-vaulted varieties, though often magnificent, are essentially survivals of older systems which have reached their full development. The organic type alone, I repeat, is the distinctive and transitional Romanesque of the Middle Ages which culminated in the Gothic style of the Ile de France.



JUMIÈGES.

## THE LATE JOHN BELCHER, R.A.

**A Biographical Notice.** By James W. James [A.]

THIS distinguished architect was born on the 10th July 1841, at Trinity Square, Southwark. He died, after a few days' illness, at his residence, "Redholm," Champion Hill, on the 8th November 1913, and was buried at Norwood Cemetery.

His father, Mr. John Belcher, was an architect and surveyor who carried on practice at 5 Adelaide Place, London Bridge, and served on the Council of the Institute and on the Board of Examiners for District Surveyors. He had artistic and musical gifts which his son inherited, and was also an able man of business, but his son's strength lay in other directions, although his quiet persistence usually gained the object he had in view.

John Belcher senior was twice married. His first wife, by whom he had ten children, the subject of this notice being the eldest, was the third daughter of George Woollett, of Chigwell, who was related to the eminent engraver, William Woollett, whose "works rank among the great productions of the English School of engraving" [Encyc. Brit. vol. xxiv. p. 663]. The latter was born in 1735 at Maidstone, of a family which originally came from Holland. He was appointed engraver-in-ordinary to George III., and died in 1785, being buried in the churchyard of St. Pancras, Middlesex. A memorial tablet was erected to his memory in the west cloister of Westminster Abbey. Probably our late colleague derived his many-sided artistic character from his Woollett ancestry, as other members of that family had similar gifts.

John Belcher was educated at private schools, and spent a year or two at school in Luxembourg. He was fond of sketching, and two views which he made at this time of the fortifications of Luxembourg were engraved in the *Illustrated London News* in 1867, when in consequence of the Franco-German dispute sketching was prohibited. He received his professional education at his father's office, but was placed for a time in the office of another architect in order to gain experience.

About 1862-3, at his father's wish, he spent some time in Paris studying and sketching modern French architecture. The fruit of this was seen when he assisted his father in the design for the Royal Insurance offices in Lombard Street, which have since been pulled down. The design for this building may be regarded, at least so far as the detail and external adornment were concerned, as the first design of John Belcher junior which was executed. The style was French Renaissance, and a good deal of sculpture was introduced, two figures over the doorway being the work of Thomas, the father of Hamo Thornycroft, R.A. The work is evidence that Mr. Belcher from the very beginning of his career considered that architecture should embrace in its scope the arts of sculpture and painting. His

later works prove that he consistently acted on this conception, and on receiving the Gold Medal in 1907 he acknowledged the assistance he had received from many great sculptors, who at one time or another had aided him in giving expression and artistic embellishment to his buildings.

After the erection of the Royal Insurance Buildings, Mr. Belcher had much to do with the design for the Commercial Union Assurance Company's offices in Cornhill, and other buildings in the City for which his father was architect, but with the other part of his father's practice—that of a surveyor—he had little sympathy.

On the 8th June 1865, Mr. Belcher married Florence, eldest daughter of Matthew Parker, of Dublin, a highly cultured lady and a charming conversationalist, to whom may be attributed much of his success in the exercise of his profession. It is well known that architects have dark days, and perhaps more personal disappointments than other professional men, but Mrs. Belcher's lively disposition and diverting Irish humour cheered and encouraged him.

When invited in 1899 to go to California as Norman Shaw's representative to adjudicate on the designs for the Phœbe Hearst University, he intended to decline, but on mentioning it to his wife, she remarked: "Nothing of the sort, of course you will go, and I will go with you." So they went, and had a most enjoyable time. The diary Mrs. Belcher kept, illustrated with sketches by her husband, and filled with photographs and newspaper cuttings regarding the country and the great competition, forms a most interesting and entertaining record of their visit.

At the time of his marriage Mr. Belcher was taken into partnership by his father. His chief work at this stage of his career was the building at the east corner of Poultry and Queen Victoria Street for Mr. Jas. Wheeler, now occupied by Mappin & Webb, Ltd., for whom the ground floor and basement were reconstructed in 1909. Mr. Belcher at this period was under the influence of the Gothic movement, and followed the example of Godwin, Street, and Burges. In 1875 a building he designed in the "Queen Anne" manner for the west corner of Poultry and Bucklersbury showed a marked change in his style. In 1871 he designed a small Hall in the Tudor style for the Worshipful Company of Curriers, which was shortly afterwards pulled down for the erection of warehouses for Rylands & Son, Ltd. In 1874 the present Hall for the Curriers' Company in London Wall, in fifteenth-century French Gothic, was erected, with the warehouses adjoining. Later on, other warehouses were erected for Messrs. Rylands in Philip Lane and Wood Street. Owing to exceptional circumstances the Wood Street building had to be framed with iron columns and stanchions and rolled iron joists, and roofed in, so that the work could go on without cessation, thus anticipating the later

steel-framed buildings. In 1882 these warehouses were destroyed, or very much injured, by the great Wood Street fire, and were rebuilt by Mr. Belcher.

About 1875 John Belcher senior practically retired from business, and his son entered into a partnership arrangement with the writer of this notice, who had been in his father's office since 1860. This arrangement lasted until 1882. In 1885 he made a similar arrangement with Mr., now Professor, Beresford Pite, which continued until 1897.

scale at Stowell Park, Northleach, for the Earl of Eldon. "The gardens of Stowell Park, and many of his houses, have been specially designed by Mr. Belcher. This is a matter which he felt to be of great importance, as it enabled him to link the buildings with the site, throwing out tendrils in the shape of terraces, walls, and hedges to tie it to the ground" [Architectural Review, Oct. 1908]. Most notable of all his works, perhaps, was the competition design, carried out without alteration, for the Institute of Chartered Accountants, Moorgate Place, a building which, on account of its originality, has attracted a great deal of attention, and has had a marked influence in the progress of the "free Classic" style in English architecture.

The most prolific period in Mr. Belcher's practice was from 1897 to the present time. The list of works executed from his designs extends to such a length that it is difficult to make a selection without carrying this notice to an undue length, but the most important buildings were: the Town Hall, Colchester (1898); Electra House, Finsbury Pavement (1900); Cornbury Park, Oxon. (1901); premises for the *Birmingham Post*, Fleet Street (1902), and the Royal London Friendly Society, Finsbury Square (1905); Memorial, Lancaster Park, for Lord Ashton (1906); premises in Oxford Street for Mappin & Webb, Ltd. (1907); Royal Insurance Buildings, St. James's Street, Zoological Society's Buildings, Regent's Park, and Holy Trinity Church, Kingsway (1909); Messrs. Whiteley's new premises, Bayswater, and the building for the Royal Society of Medicine (1910).

In 1905 Mr. Belcher took into partnership Mr. John James Joass, who had been in his office for about eight years previously. The partnership was in existence at the time of his lamented death, and the practice will be continued by Mr. Joass.

In 1890 Mr. Belcher had removed his offices from 5 Adelaide Place, London Bridge, to 20 Hanover Square, and in 1911 from Hanover Square to 9 Clifford Street, Bond Street.

The only churches Mr. Belcher built were the Catholic Apostolic Church, Camberwell New Road (1875), and Holy Trinity Church, Kingsway (1909), the one Gothic and the other Classic. He also restored Kineton Church, Warwickshire, and South Marston Church, Wiltshire, where are painted panels in the reredos by his then assistant, Mr. Harry Wilson. He prepared designs for a top-lighted church at Westminster, for a large



THE LATE JOHN BELCHER, R.A.

From the Portrait painted for the Institute by Mr. Frank Dicksee, R.A.

From 1881 to 1897 Mr. Belcher designed some charmingly thought-out domestic work, original, but evincing his admiration for and sympathy with Mr. Norman Shaw's methods. Among these works may be mentioned Eyo House, in Chiswick Mall, for Sir John Thornycroft, and a studio for Mr. Hamo Thornycroft; studio, &c., for Mr. Alfred Sassoon; Holcombe Wood, near Chatham; Morden Grange, Blackheath; Yeldhall Manor, near Twyford, originally named Bearroc; Mark Ash, Surrey; The Towers, Pangbourne, for Mr. Donaldson, and his own house, Redholm, Champion Hill; also the restoration with additions on a large and important

church at Paddington, and for the completion of Raphael Brandon's great church in Gordon Square ; but, with the exception of the carving in the nave of the latter church, none of these designs were carried out.

Mr. Belcher was also interested in literary work. Besides Papers read at the Institute, *e.g.* that on Musical Arrangements in Churches (17th December 1888), which led to a Committee being appointed, and a Report (published in 1892) on the Position of Organs in Churches, he wrote on public questions in which architecture was concerned, and in collaboration with Mr. Mervyn Macartney he published a most exhaustive work on the Late English Renaissance. Later he published a book on the "Essentials in Architecture," chiefly addressed to the general public.

As a musician he displayed considerable gifts as singer, composer, and conductor. His first published book, which appeared in 1872, was a short "History of Ecclesiastical Music." He frequently sang for charity or private concerts, and on one of these occasions he made the acquaintance of the late Professor John Ella, and joined a Musical Society which met at Mr. Ella's house in Victoria Square, S.W. From this time, about 1870, until Mr. Ella's death in 1888, he enjoyed the privilege of meeting most of the great musicians of that period, personal friends of Mr. Ella, who were engaged to play at the "Musical Union" Concerts in St. James's Hall. He was also a very intimate friend of the late Dr. Turpin, of the College of Organists, and sang in public for him on several occasions, taking the bass solos in "Elijah," "St. Paul," &c., the most notable performance being that of Dr. Turpin's "Song of Faith" in 1867, the soloists being amateurs, and the instrumentalists selected from the best orchestras in London. It is related of him that once, after he had been singing, he overheard two gentlemen talking together : "Who was that fellow who sang just now, that professional I mean ?" said one. "Oh," replied the other, "that was John Belcher, an architect." "Well," said the first, "he can't be much of an architect if he can sing like that" [M.A.P., 12th December 1903]. In later years he sang little in public. The composition and proportion of an orchestra naturally appealed to him as being analogous to the proportions of a building—no excess in any one part, but each contributing to form a perfectly balanced structure. In his reply on receiving the Gold Medal, he compared an architect and his associates to a conductor of an orchestra, leading and directing the executants in the interpretation of a work of his own composition. (JOURNAL, Vol. XIV. p. 572.)

Mr. Belcher received many honours, as the following list shows :—

Royal Academician (1909) ; President of the Royal Institute of British Architects from 1904 to 1906, and of the International Congress of Archi-

tects (1906) ; Vice-President of the International Society of Architects ; Membre Agrégé de l'Académie Royale d'Anvers ; Hon. Member Society of Architects, Amsterdam, and Hon. Member of the Architectural Societies of Russia, Belgium, Germany, Spain, and the United States ; Corresponding Member of the French Society of Architects, of the Society of Architects diplômés by the French Government, and of the Society of Architects, Portugal ; Freedom of the City of San Francisco ; Gold Medallist, Paris Exhibition, 1900 ; Royal Gold Medallist, R.I.B.A. (1907).

In 1905 a dinner was held in his honour by his past and present assistants and pupils, when warm expression was given of their appreciation of him as an artist, of the great ability of his work, and of their esteem for him as a man whose influence and personality they so much valued.

The writer of this notice, who was an intimate friend of Mr. Belcher for over fifty years, would have liked to give fuller expression to his appreciation of Mr. Belcher and his work ; but it is not only unnecessary but impossible for him to add anything to the article by Mr. Mervyn Macartney in the JOURNAL for the 22nd November, and to the sympathetic speeches by Mr. Guy Dawber and Professor Beresford Pite, in which so touching a tribute is paid to our late colleague's lovable personality and artistic genius. "Those who knew him longest must have loved him most."

Mr. PHILIP M. JOHNSTON, F.S.A. [F.], writes :—

I gladly comply with the request to communicate my personal recollections of John Belcher, whose somewhat sudden decease all are deplored.

When I became his pupil, in 1881, he was "John Belcher junior," of Messrs. J. & J. Belcher, his father, who lived for some ten years after that date, having retired from active practice. Father and son had for long been close personal friends of my own father ; and my elder brother, George Hamilton Johnston, who died in 1878, had preceded me as a pupil. The office then was at No. 5 Adelaide Place, London Bridge, opposite to Fishmongers' Hall, and I recollect that it used to be said that Mr. Belcher senior, in his early married life, had lived on the top floor of the building, over the office. It was a very homely office in those early days. James Walter James, an Associate of the Institute, was closely associated with Mr. Belcher in practice, and Arthur Belcher, a younger brother, was senior assistant. The work done, besides competitions (which were rarely successful), consisted of large city offices and warehouses, of which those for Messrs. Rylands of London Wall stand out in my memory—houses such as that for Sir John Thornycroft, on Chiswick Mall, a Cottage Hospital at Norwood, an early instance of this type of building—and, very occasionally, a bit of church building or restoration.

In 1882 Arthur Beresford Pite, now so well known as Professor Pite, came to Mr. Belcher as an "improver," and remained after his year's work as an assistant, leaving to take up the sub-editorship of *The Builder*, and returning in 1885. His magnetic personality influenced Mr. Belcher very strongly, and left its impress on the character of the work turned out. This was markedly the case in regard to the designs for the enlargement and restoration of Stowell Park, Gloucestershire, the seat of the Earl of Eldon, carried out between 1884 and 1887, and in the remarkably successful building for the Institute of Chartered Accountants, Moorgate Place, which may be said to have started a new phase in modern civic architecture, and to have produced numerous imitations.

During the last year of my pupilage, 1885-6, a somewhat elaborate church restoration—that of South Marston, Wilts—was undertaken by Mr. Belcher, who handed over to me most of the detail work and supervision. With the exception of Kineton Church, Warwickshire, restored a few years previously, and of Stowell Church, Gloucestershire, which was taken in hand after I had left the office, Mr. Belcher had little to do with church building and restoration. In 1903, while enlarging the house at Cornbury Park, Oxfordshire, Mr. Belcher restored the small hamlet-chapel of Shorthampton for the same client, Mr. Vernon Watney, and I had the pleasure of assisting him in bringing to light some very noteworthy wall-paintings; but his name is identified with several ecclesiastical designs in connection with the Catholic Apostolic Church: namely, for the completion of Raphael Brandon's grand church in Gordon Square (not carried out);\* for the large red brick building in the Camberwell New Road, executed in 1875, and in the limited competition for a new church in Paddington for the same body. Almost the last work upon which Mr. Belcher was engaged, which was, in fact, hardly completed at the time of his death, was the redecoration of the sanctuary in the Camberwell New Road Church, in a portion of which work I had the pleasure of being associated with him. Within the last two or three years Holy Trinity Church, in Kingsway, has been rebuilt from Mr. Belcher's designs in a neo-classic style.

I am not in a position to speak either with fullest knowledge or entire sympathy of the numerous important civic buildings and mansions executed during the last twenty years from Mr. Belcher's designs. Others who have been associated with him during this period of his practice can do so with much better effect. My own immediate knowledge is of his "earlier manner." In this was built his own most charming little house, a

\* In about 1895 the "blocks" left by Brandon in the interior were carved, with great success, under Mr. Belcher's superintendence—much to the enhancement of this beautiful church.

stone's throw from where I write, in that graceful rendering of late Tudor that he always seemed to me to be so peculiarly at home in. Mr. Belcher's literary and musical activities are too well known to need comment from me. Dr. Turpin, the organist, and Professor Ella, were among his close personal friends, and many musical evenings were spent at Redholm with such kindred spirits.

Of the men who passed through Mr. Belcher's office during my time, either as pupils, improvers, or assistants, besides Professor Pite, I recall the following: T. Phillips Figgis [F.], Needham Wilson [A.], H. Watson K. Martin (now, I believe, practising in Australia), Percy Mantell, deceased, Professor H. Wilson, and Arthur H. Belcher [A.]. Another brother, Wm. Douglas Belcher, who died in 1911, had an independent practice, but assisted a good deal in the office. There have, of course, been many other men, some of considerable ability, who have worked under him since my day.

It is difficult to write for publication critically and dispassionately of such a man as Mr. Belcher, to whom one has looked for the greater part of a lifetime both as master and friend; but I may perhaps permit myself one criticism on his personal character. The quality which has always struck me most was his unassuming modesty. In one who has left a record of much really great work, and who in private life was adorned with many gifts and graces, such humility and gentleness as marked Mr. Belcher in his intercourse with all and sundry are refreshingly beautiful, as they are rare qualities in this pushful age.

PHILIP MAINWARING JOHNSTON.

Sir CHARLES NICHOLSON, Bart. [F.], writes:—

In the obituary notice published in the last issue of the JOURNAL John Belcher's design for a church at Maida Vale is described as being the prototype of John Sedding's work at Holy Trinity, Chelsea. I was a pupil of Sedding's at the time when the Maida Vale design was first published, but the building of Chelsea Church was three parts finished at the time when I entered Sedding's office.

I venture therefore to make a correction in the interests of historical accuracy, although it is a matter of little moment which of two brother artists first happened to hit upon a certain idea where both were inspired by the single motive of doing what came to the hand of each in the best manner possible. For it is not plagiarism to take an intelligent interest in the works of one's contemporaries, any more than it is plagiarism to study the works of the ancients.

All honour then both to the originator of a new idea, and to his brother artist who has the perception to appreciate it, and perhaps to develop it in the face of prejudice and convention.

CHARLES A. NICHOLSON.

## THE TOWN PLANNING INSTITUTE.

**T**OWN Planning is a new activity in this country; and while it has not developed into a separate profession, there are members of several professions who have made a special study or practice of it. Of these some are architects, some engineers, some surveyors, while sociologists and economists have made valuable contributions to the solution of the problems it presents, and men of legal training have worked to determine the constructive effect of the laws which have a bearing on the subject, and to find clear expression for the new regulations required.

As regards the actual planning, the three first-named professions have hitherto shared an activity which has this special character, that it includes work usually associated with all of these professions. No single man can carry out extensive Town Planning schemes without a fair general knowledge of surveying and land development, of municipal engineering and of architecture, especially that very important branch of it which deals with the disposition and grouping of buildings. He must at least know enough of each of these professions to realise his own limitations, and to know when he should seek the advice of an expert in any one branch. It is perhaps natural that some members of each of these professions should think the one to which he belongs peculiarly fitted to undertake the work, consulting the others when necessary. Time alone will show what method of co-operation between them will prove most satisfactory.

Meantime, in a field of work where all alike are beginners, mutual support and interchange of ideas are of special value. For this and other reasons, a group of those engaged in Town Planning have been meeting together for a year or more, spending an evening about once a month cultivating each other's society and hearing each other's views. This group felt that the time had come to carry the matter a step further, and so it was determined to invite a number of others to come together and discuss the formation of a Town Planning Institute.

It was at one time thought by some that a branch of an existing Institute would meet the need of the case; but the general feeling gathered strength that if effective progress was to be made, as those who must be brought together belonged to so many different professions, it would be better to form a separate Institute for this purpose. This view was shared by the larger group invited to attend the recent meeting, at which it was decided to form the Institute. It is proposed that there shall be general members belonging to one of the three professions of architect, engineer, or surveyor, and members associated with these who belong to the legal or other professions and who have specialised in one or other branch of Town Planning.

The objects aimed at by the Institute are to advance the study of Town Planning and civic design, to promote the artistic and scientific development of towns and cities, and to secure the association of those engaged or interested in the practice of town planning. It is not intended that the Institute shall be a propagandist body or cover in any way ground already well occupied by the Garden Cities and Town Planning Association, the National Housing and Town Planning Council, or the London Society; rather, that the Institute shall do for town planners, irrespective of the particular profession from which they may be drawn, what the other professional Institutes do for their members.

At the meeting which was held on 21st November the following were elected Honorary Vice-Presidents:—

The Right Hon. John Burns, M.P.  
Sir John Wolfe Barry.  
Sir Alexander Steuning.  
Sir Aston Webb.

It is hoped that these gentlemen will form a small Council of Reference representing the different aspects of the subject.

For the first Council the following were elected:

<i>Architects.</i>	<i>Engineers.</i>
S. D. Adshead.	J. A. Brodie.
H. V. Lanchester.	J. W. Cockrill.
P. T. Runton.	W. T. Lancashire.
Raymond Unwin.	H. E. Stilgoe.

  

<i>Surveyors.</i>	<i>Associated Members.</i>
Thomas Adams.	E. R. Abbott.
W. L. Davidge.	J. S. Birkett.
G. L. Pepler.	

Mr. G. L. Pepler has kindly consented to act as Honorary Secretary and Treasurer for the time being. It is hoped that in due course a place may be found in the Institute for Students of the subject and Associates who are beginning their practice; while as Honorary Members there will be associated with the Institute persons of distinction who have taken a special interest in town planning, including town planners of other nationalities.

Extensions of the Town Planning movement are rapidly taking place, others are foreshadowed, and there can be no doubt that such an Institute as is contemplated should prove of great value in guiding the work into right lines.

RAYMOND UNWIN [F.]

## Mr. Batsford's "Fellowship Books."

The publication is announced of the second six volumes of this charming series—viz., "Fairies," by G. M. Faulding; "Freedom," by A. Martin Freeman; "Solitude," by Norman Gale; "A Spark Divine: a Book for Animal Lovers," by R. C. Lehmann; "Childhood," by Alice Meynell; and "Romance," by Ernest Rhys. The volumes are elegantly printed and bound, are of a convenient size for the pocket, and serve admirably for the little mementoes that people exchange with their friends at this season.

## STATUTORY REGISTRATION OF ARCHITECTS.

### REPORT AND RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE COUNCIL.

Submitted for the consideration of Members of the Royal Institute of British Architects at a Special General Meeting, held Monday, 1st December 1913.

[*N.B.—The various documents referred to in the Report of the Registration Committee (p. 82), which were not before the Meeting last Monday, are included herewith, by direction of the President, in accordance with his statement at the Meeting. They form Appendices B, C, D, E.]*

On the 8th January 1912 the proposals of the Council for the absorption of the Society of Architects and the promotion of a Registration Bill were submitted to a General Meeting of the Royal Institute and referred back to the Council for further consideration. The Council thereupon appointed a Committee, with numerous representatives of the provincial Societies, to consider the whole question of Registration and to report to the Council upon it.

The Registration Committee devoted more than twelve months to an exhaustive discussion of the business referred to them, and on 28th March 1913 presented to the Council a Report, of which a copy is appended (Appendix A). It will be seen that the Report emphasised the fact that in the opinion of the expert advisers of the Royal Institute there is very little prospect of any Bill for the Statutory Registration of Architects becoming law in the near future, and stated that, in the opinion of that Committee, "many years must elapse and great (possibly useless) expenditure must be incurred before Statute can be effected."

The Council, acting on the advice of the Registration Committee, decided to obtain the opinions of the Councils of the Allied Societies upon the alternative policies suggested in the Report—namely, that of proceeding at once with the Bill as drafted, or, in the alternative, that of obtaining by a new Charter the recognition by the Privy Council of the compulsory Examinations of the R.I.B.A. for all intending Architects, and of such a Scale of Charges as the Privy Council may approve.

In April 1913 copies of the Report of the Registration Committee were sent confidentially to these bodies, and they were requested to give careful consideration to it and to submit their opinions to the R.I.B.A. Council in due course. The Council meanwhile decided to appoint a representative Committee, to be called the Constitutional Committee, for the purpose of considering all matters that might affect the constitution, organisation, and functions of the Royal Institute. As the Bill drafted by the Registration Committee had a serious bearing upon these points, the Report was referred to this Committee, who were requested to consider it from the constitutional point of view, and to report to the Council upon the alternative policies suggested by the Registration Committee.

The Constitutional Committee carefully considered the subject referred to them, and had the advantage of having before them the opinions received, up to date, from the Councils of the Allied Societies. A brief précis of these replies is contained in Appendix F.

Though some of the replies are in favour of proceeding with a Registration Bill in Parliament, the Council are strongly impressed by the reluctance of others to take such a course, and by the opinion so definitely expressed by the Registration Committee as to the extreme difficulty of getting such a Bill placed upon the Statute Book.

The Resolutions of the General Meeting of 4th March 1907 committed the Institute to the policy of endeavouring to obtain the Statutory Registration of Architects through the Institute; but it now appears to the Council that the possibility of obtaining such legislation is extremely remote, and they are further of opinion that the Supplementary Charter of 1909 and the By-Laws governing the Licentiate class, and also the By-Laws made under the Charter of 1887 which limit the voting power of the Associate class, present serious obstacles to Parliamentary action by the Royal Institute.

The Council point out that the Charters and By-Laws of the R.I.B.A. would be materially affected by a Registration Bill, and that a Bill cannot be successfully promoted unless it has the express support of all classes of Members of the Institute, whose opinion must be obtained and recorded at General Meetings, and, inasmuch as at such Meetings Licentiates cannot vote, the express support of this class cannot be obtained.

The Council are therefore of opinion that it is essential to remove the disabilities referred to above before any further action can be taken in respect of Registration by the Royal Institute.

Under these circumstances the Council are of opinion that the Institute would be well advised to adopt the alternative policy suggested in the Report of the Registration Committee, and to apply to the Privy Council for a new Charter, which would at the same time obtain for duly qualified Architects a public recognition of their qualifications, give them substantial benefits which cannot be obtained at present by any other means, and remove the existing obstacles in the way of any future Parliamentary action.

The Council are of opinion that the time has come to present a petition praying His Majesty to grant a new Charter containing such further privileges and powers as are required to promote effectively the advancement of Architecture by enabling the R.I.B.A. to register and to distinguish persons qualified to practise, and that His Majesty should be asked to ordain as follows :—

- (1) That all persons who at the time of the granting of the Charter have received a diploma of Membership and the rank either of Fellow, Associate, or Licentiate, and all persons being members of and approved by a Society allied with the R.I.B.A. or of any branch of the R.I.B.A. who at the time of the granting of the Charter are shown to be engaged in the practice of Architecture, and all persons who after the granting of the Charter shall have been examined and duly approved by the Council of the R.I.B.A., shall have the exclusive right to use and may use the distinctive title "Chartered Architect," in addition to any other diploma, rank, title, honour, or dignity to which such person may be entitled. That the Royal Institute shall be empowered to make and maintain a Register of all persons entitled to use the distinction of "Chartered Architect."
- (2) That the R.I.B.A. be authorised, notwithstanding any disabilities at present existing, to make or amend By-Laws to ensure to all classes of Members adequate representation on the Council and Standing Committees and in all matters affecting the advancement of Architecture and in the control of Chartered Architects.
- (3) That the Council of the R.I.B.A., for the purpose of assisting and directing Architectural Education and testing the qualification of persons desirous of practising Architecture, be authorised to control all Examinations held to qualify for the distinction of "Chartered Architect," and, subject to the approval of the Privy Council, to appoint Examiners for the conduct of such Examinations. That the Council of the R.I.B.A. be authorised to charge to candidates for Examination and to Chartered Architects on receiving distinctions or diplomas granted by the R.I.B.A., such fees, annual and otherwise, as the Privy Council may approve, and to pay Examiners such fees as the Council of the R.I.B.A. may determine and the Privy Council may approve.
- (4) That the Council of the R.I.B.A. be authorised to permit persons who have passed such Examinations in Architecture as shall have been approved by the Council of the R.I.B.A. to use the distinction of "Chartered Architect."
- (5) That the disabilities imposed by previous Charters and the By-Laws on Associate Members be repealed, and that all Chartered Architects on obtaining Associate rank of the R.I.B.A. be permitted to vote on all matters connected with the management of the Institute, including the Charters and the By-Laws.
- (6) That the disabilities imposed by previous Charters and By-Laws on Licentiates be repealed and that Chartered Architects holding Licentiate rank of the Institute be permitted to serve on the Council or on any Committee if duly elected and to be represented on the Council or on any of the four Standing Committees of Art, Literature, Practice, and Science by duly elected representatives.
- That the Council of the R.I.B.A. be enabled to constitute representatives of the Licentiate class, to a number not exceeding 10 to every 100 Licentiates at any time in the class, to be elected by the Licentiates in a manner to be hereafter determined.
- That such representatives be empowered to vote on behalf of the Licentiate class at any General Meeting specially convened for the purpose of dealing with any matter affecting the rights, privileges, emoluments, or discipline of Chartered Architects, and to vote on behalf of the Licentiate class in the election of the Council and the Standing Committees.
- (7) That the Council of the R.I.B.A. be reconstituted and consist of :—
  - 1 President.
  - 4 Vice-Presidents.
  - 1 Hon. Secretary.
  - 21 Fellows.

## 10 Associates.

Such numbers of the Presidents of Allied Societies as the Council may determine.

1 Representative of the Architectural Association.

The Chairmen of the four Standing Committees (*ex officio*).

The Chairman of the Board of Architectural Education (*ex officio*).

1 Licentiate representative to each complete 400 members of the Licentiate class, the number of representatives at no time to exceed five.

That the Council be given power, by Resolution of the Council confirmed by the General Body, to alter the relative proportions of their Members and to add to or diminish their numbers.

(8) That the Royal Institute be empowered, subject to the approval of the Privy Council, to issue a Scale of Fees payable to Chartered Architects.

(9) That the Royal Institute shall be able and capable in law to purchase, possess, hold and enjoy a Hall, Messuages, Lands, and Tenements or Hereditaments of a yearly value not exceeding £5,000 per annum.\*

(10) That subject to the provisions contained in the new Charter the other Charters of the Institute shall, so far as unrepealed, have full effect and validity, and shall be confirmed accordingly.

## APPENDIX A.

## REPORT OF THE REGISTRATION COMMITTEE, 1912-13.

To the President and Council, Royal Institute of British Architects,—

Reason for report.

Solicitors and Parliamentary Agent consulted.

Reasons: Principles unsuitable for Bill.

Contrary to public policy; consequently no public case.

Past action has failed to achieve desired result.

Disabilities of one class.

Resulting position and action adopted.

Draft Bill of 1905 considered and amended.

The Committee have held fifteen meetings.

1. After considering the *established principles* governing Registration and the position created by the action already taken by the R.I.B.A., the Committee first submitted a complete case for Registration as it stands to-day to Messrs. Markby, Stewart & Co., Solicitors, and Mr. John Kennedy, Parliamentary Agent, and were by them advised that a Bill strictly in accordance with the established principles appeared to be impracticable for the following among other reasons:—

(a) That the established principles are not suitable material on which to frame a Bill.

(b) That it is contrary to public policy and Parliamentary practice to create such a monopoly as would result from a measure based on the established principles as defined by the Reports, recommendations, and resolutions set out in Appendix B, and no public case can be made out in justification.

(c) The action taken by the R.I.B.A. in pursuance of the course authorised and based on the established principles has failed to achieve the expected and desired result, the whole of the practising Architects not being included in the membership, and now cannot be, as the Class of Licentiates is closed.

(d) That if such an Act were passed, a complete class of Members (namely, Licentiates) would be amenable to statutory control without representation on the Governing Body.

They would thus be in a worse position under the Act than members of Allied or other Societies, and this cannot be altered in view of the terms of establishment and conditions under which this class has been formed and Members admitted.

2. In the position thus disclosed the Committee felt that a Report which merely stated these facts would be useless, and that it would be impossible for the General Body to arrive at a proper decision unless at least a suggestion for a Parliamentary Bill suitable to the position which has arisen was simultaneously placed before it.

The Committee, therefore, proceeded to consider a measure on these broad lines such as the Committee believe the profession now demands, and which, moreover, they were advised is the only practical solution if Registration is to be effected by Statute.

The Draft Registration Bill of 1905, having been recommended to the Committee by Messrs. Markby, Stewart and Mr. Kennedy as a suitable measure of this kind, was accordingly considered, and, having

\* At the present time the yearly value as fixed by Charter is £2,000. Having regard to the present value of property owned by the Institute this is not considered sufficient, and an amount should be ordained by Charter somewhat in excess of the present total value of the real estate and leasehold property of the R.I.B.A.

been thoroughly revised and brought up to date, is now presented to the Council, the Committee being of opinion that as this Draft Bill as now revised goes beyond the principles adopted by the General Body on March 4, 1907, the Council should consider and come to a decision upon it before any further steps are taken by the Committee.

3. The Committee desire to emphasise the fact that they are advised there is very little prospect of any Bill of this nature becoming law in the near future: Parliamentary prospects.

Firstly, by reason of its subject-matter.

Secondly, in consequence of the present congested state of public business.

In confirmation of this view the Committee beg to refer to the fact that analogous Bills promoted by the Chartered Accountants and by the Society of Architects which have been in course of promotion for many years past cannot be said even yet to have emerged into the Parliamentary arena.

4. It is only fair to state that the Committee were not unanimous about the Bill, and that widely divergent views were held on the subject generally and on its principles, procedure, and details. Divergent views. Opposition to be expected.

From the discussions which have taken place in the Committee, and from the evidence before us, we are of opinion that many years will elapse and great (possibly useless) expenditure must be incurred before Registration by Statute can be effected.

Registration being so complex and controversial a subject, there seems every prospect that when the present position is explained to the General Body of Members, and the Bill is laid before them, a similar divergence of opinion will be found and considerable opposition will be encountered.

5. This, in conjunction with the urgent need for some action to be taken by the R.I.B.A. to allay the agitation, now of many years' standing, and detrimentally affecting the welfare of all practising Architects, suggests the necessity for the Council to call the General Body of Members together at an early date for the following purposes:— Necessity for action.

(a) To receive the Reports of the Solicitors and Parliamentary Agent.

Steps suggested.

(b) To examine the Bill as drafted and, having done so, to decide:—

(1) Whether an attempt should be made to get the Bill passed as drafted, or with such modifications as may be found necessary; or, if not,

(2) Whether some alternative course apart from Statutory Registration should be determined on, such as obtaining by a new Charter the recognition by the Privy Council of the compulsory Examinations of the R.I.B.A. for all intending Architects, and of such a Scale of Charges as the Privy Council may approve.

6. In conclusion and explanation we venture to point out that a review of the evidence necessary for the preparation of this Report has forced upon us the opinion that there are very serious difficulties in the way of obtaining Statutory Registration, and that, having regard to the great importance of the subject, the Council should consider the advisability of submitting this Report to all the Allied Societies before presenting it to the General Body.

We have the honour to be,

Mr. President and Gentlemen,

Your obedient Servants,

JOHN SLATER, *Chairman.*

C. STANLEY PEACH.

28th March 1913.

#### APPENDIX B.

##### PRÉCIS OF THE ESTABLISHED PRINCIPLES ABSTRACTED FROM THE FOLLOWING DOCUMENTS:—

Report of the Registration Committee dated 20th March 1906.

Resolutions thereon carried at the General Meeting held 3rd April 1906.

Report of the Council on the resolutions regarding the question of registration passed 3rd April 1906, and dated 25th February 1907, approved by resolution of the General Body on the 4th March 1907.

The Committee having heard evidence from all parts of the United Kingdom, found as a fact that there was a general desire to obtain a legal status for duly qualified architects. General desire for registration.

Recom-  
mendation.

Suggested  
procedure.

The Committee recommended application to Parliament for a legal Diploma of Membership R.I.B.A.  
The Committee suggested as means to this end :—

- \*(1) Revision of the Charter.
- (2) Submission of a Bill to Parliament.
- \*(3) Alteration of method of electing Fellows.
- \*(4) A compulsory scheme of education.
- \*(5) The creation of a new class to be called Licentiates without power to vote.
- (6) Increase of disciplinary powers and the right to appeal.

Bill to Parliament to provide for :—

- (1) Power to the R.I.B.A. to supervise education and hold examinations for diploma.
- (2) To confirm present titles of Members.
- (3) To give statutory force to present Charters.
- (4) To legalise a scale of charges.

*Note.*—The Council were authorised to consider these suggestions and report, and to take the steps necessary to obtain a Supplementary Charter, and to present Bill to Parliament when scheme above outlined perfected.

By the Report of the Council dated 4th March 1907, the foregoing was amplified and explained, a procedure suggested, and the whole summarised into principles as follows :—

Principle A.—The R.I.B.A. to endeavour to obtain Parliamentary recognition of membership.

Principle B.—After fixed date diploma only to be granted after passing definite course of education.

Principle C.—Temporary class of Licentiates without voting power to be established ; to be open for twelve months after Charter obtained.

Principle D.—Fellows to be elected from Associate Class by Council in special cases.

Principle E.—Disciplinary powers of the Institute to be increased by obtaining powers to publish expulsion of Members in the public Press.

The following points were enunciated as essential in any Act of Parliament :—

Principle F.—The public to be enabled to distinguish between architects recognised by a competent authority as qualified or otherwise.

Principle G.—To extend the Charter privileges of the R.I.B.A., making it the statutory authority for the education and examination of architects for admission to the Institute.

Principle H.—To legalise the scale of charges.

#### APPENDIX C.

#### PRECIS OF THE ADVICE AND RECOMMENDATIONS ON REGISTRATION OF MESSRS. MARKBY, STEWART & CO., INSTITUTE SOLICITORS, AND MR. JOHN KENNEDY, PARLIAMENTARY AGENT OF THE INSTITUTE.

The Reports are dated February 1912 and October 1912.

The latter Report was verbal and was reported to the Committee by the Sub-Committee 4th November 1912.

On the assumption that the R.I.B.A. desires to promote a Bill on broad lines, Messrs. Markby, Stewart & Co. and Mr. John Kennedy advise :—

1. Well advised to consider and bring up to date Draft Registration Bill of 1905 prepared with assistance of Mr. Cripps, K.C., and Mr. Clode.

2. Bill probably be opposed by various kindred institutions and societies, Municipal Authorities, many Members of Parliament, and not likely to obtain facilities or support from Government.

\* N.B.—Action since taken in respect of these items.

3. Little prospect of passing into law at an early date unless compromise effected by abandoning registration and retaining merely statutory recognition of Institute examinations and Scale of Charges.

4. Bill might be introduced to feel pulse of Parliament and gauge opposition.

4A. An alternative course.—To invite general conference of kindred societies and professions with a view to preliminary or joint action.

Advisable in any case to get in touch with Government Departments, notably :—

The Local Government Board.

The Board of Trade.

The Board of Education.

5. Consider the public case which can be presented to Parliament in justification. Advice of solicitors and Parliamentary Agents on prospects of a Bill based on resolutions and established principles of 1906-7.

(a) The prospect of passing any form of Bill of this nature is hopeless in the present congested state of Parliamentary business.

(b) A Bill embodying simply established principles inadvisable as they do not contain suitable material for a Bill.

(c) As showing generally the hopelessness of a Registration Bill they cite case of Chartered Accountants on whose behalf have been acting for some years endeavouring to obtain statutory recognition.

No progress been made ; great expense incurred.

In a letter dated March 7 1912 to the Secretary, Mr. John Kennedy stated that no Bill embodying the established principles would as a private Members' Public Bill have any reasonable prospect of passing into law.

And

the time and money expended by the promoting Bodies on this Bill (Chartered Accountants) is certainly a warning to your Institute not to lightly embark on a similar venture.

#### APPENDIX D.

#### PRÉCIS OF THE DRAFT REGISTRATION BILL OF 1905 AS REVISED AND AMENDED BY REGISTRATION COMMITTEE, 1912-13, REFERRED TO IN THE INTERIM REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE TO THE COUNCIL DATED 28TH MARCH 1913.

##### OBJECTS.

##### Objects.

Educational for the general advancement of architecture.

To distinguish qualified from unqualified architects.

To limit the use of the title " Architect " to qualified persons.

To create a board to prescribe examinations and to register architects and to exercise disciplinary powers over them.

##### PROVISIONS.

Partnerships, societies or associations are not eligible for enrolment.

Combinations  
ineligible.

On the passing of the Act the following are eligible for enrolment :—

Persons  
eligible at time  
of passing  
of Act.

Fellows, Associates, and Licentiates R.I.B.A., Members (in *bona fide* practice) of Allied Societies, the Society of Architects, the Ulster Society.

Persons who have passed approved examinations.

Persons who have been in practice for two years prior to passing of Act.

Persons who have been for ten years pupils, apprentices, or assistants.

Persons who have passed prescribed examinations.

After passing  
of Act.

Persons who have passed Institute examinations.

Constitution  
of Board.

## The Constitution of the Board :—

The President. The President for the time being of the R.I.B.A., who is always to be President of the Board.

The Council of the R.I.B.A.

Presidents of Allied Societies if Fellows R.I.B.A.

## If nominated :—

One representative of Society of Architects.

One representative of Ulster Society.

Maximum of *ten* representatives nominated by Privy Council.

Election  
to the Board.

Election to the Board is to be annually after the first two years.

Members eligible for re-election.

Duties  
of the Board.

Subject to approval of the Privy Council the Board may :—

Regulate its own proceedings.

Prescribe examinations for enrolment.

Issue and cancel certificates.

Enrol and strike off Roll.

Keep and publish Roll.

Fix fees for examinations.

Disciplinary  
powers.

The following renders persons ineligible and liable to be struck off Roll after defence, with power to appeal, and in certain cases liable to be fined :—

Convicts and felons and persons fraudulently or incorrectly enrolled.

Persons guilty of disgraceful professional conduct.

Treasury and  
surplus funds.

The R.I.B.A. is to act as Treasurer for the Board.

R.I.B.A. entitled to dispose of surplus funds for objects of architectural advancement.

Obligation on R.I.B.A. to keep and publish accounts.

Enrolled architects can recover fees, others cannot.

Scale of fees according to Schedule R.I.B.A. if approved by Privy Council.

Fees and  
scale of fees.

## APPENDIX E.

## DRAFT REGISTRATION BILL.

## MEMORANDUM.

The Bill is promoted by the Royal Institute of British Architects incorporated by Royal Charters 7 William IV., 50 Victoria, and 8 Edward VII. for the general advancement of Civil Architecture and for promoting and facilitating the acquirement of the knowledge of the various arts and sciences connected therewith.

By their Charter the Institute was entrusted with and now possess powers of examining candidates for their Diploma, and by these means of exercising a salutary influence upon the profession of Civil Architecture.

During the period which has elapsed since its incorporation the Institute has become and now is the body which is most representative of the profession, and this position has been so far recognised by Parliament that their Certificate of Competency has been made by Statute necessary for the discharge of the responsible public office of District Surveyor.

The objects of the Bill are :—

(A) To enable persons requiring professional aid in the design and construction of buildings to distinguish qualified from unqualified practitioners, and to prevent untrained and incompetent persons, styling themselves architects, from imposing on the community to its material loss, danger, and detriment;

(B) To confine the use of the title "Architect" to persons enrolled under the provisions of this Bill, and also to provide for the maintenance of a Register of all such qualified persons;

(c) To create an Administrative Board of Architecture composed of the Council of the Institute, representatives of the Societies of Architects other than the Institute, and also representatives (not exceeding ten) of Universities, Institutes, and other bodies which the Privy Council may determine to be entitled to representation. Such Board to prescribe the examinations entitling to enrolment, the issue and cancellation of certificates and the removal or restoration of names from and to the Register, and generally to exercise disciplinary power over all architects with the object of promoting their efficiency and usefulness. Any rules framed by the Board to be valid only if approved by the Privy Council.

The Promoters would point out that they do not in promoting this Bill limit or in any way affect the right of those persons practising as surveyors or as builders from exercising their respective callings in as ample a manner as heretofore so long as they do not use the title of architect.

*Arrangement of Clauses.*

Clause.

1. Enrolment.
2. Provision for persons now qualified.
3. Qualifying examination for enrolment.
4. Constitution of Administrative Board of Architecture.
5. Duties of Administrative Board.
6. Roll to be kept.
7. Printed copies to be published annually and to be evidence of contents of roll.
8. Registrar.
9. Refusal to register.
10. Removal of names and alteration of roll.
11. Removal of names of convicted persons, &c.
12. Appeal from decision of Administrative Board.
13. Restoration of names removed.
14. Fees.
15. Application of fees.
16. Penalty for obtaining a certificate by false representation.
17. Penalty for wilful falsification of roll.
18. Scale fees.
19. Act not to apply to naval architects.
20. Interpretation.
21. Short title and commencement.

SCHEDULES.

A BILL

TO

SECURE THE ENROLMENT OF ARCHITECTS.

Be it enacted by the King's most Excellent Majesty by and with the advice and consent of the Lords Spiritual and Temporal and Commons in this present Parliament assembled, and by the authority of the same, as follows :—

1.—(1) After the first day of \* a person shall not be entitled Enrolment.  
to describe himself as an architect whether by advertisement, by description on his place of business, by any document issued by him or otherwise, unless he is enrolled as an architect in pursuance of this Act.

(2) If any person either alone or in conjunction with any other person or body of persons knowingly describes himself as an architect in contravention of this section, either by taking or using any other name, title, abbreviation, letters, or description calculated to induce people to believe that he is enrolled under this Act or is a person qualified to practise architecture, he shall be liable on summary conviction to a fine not exceeding *twenty pounds*, and to be restrained by injunction or interdict from using such description.

\* A date to be hereafter decided.

Provision for persons now qualified.

Qualifying examination for enrolment.

Constitution of Administrative Board.

Duties of Administrative Board.

Roll to be kept.

Printed copies to be published annually, and to be evidence of contents of roll.

(3) Partnerships, Societies, or other associations of persons carrying on business under a common name, and whether corporate or incorporate, shall not be entitled to be enrolled under this Act.

2. Any person who within one year from the date of this Act coming into operation claims to be enrolled under this Act shall be so enrolled, provided—

(1) He is either a Fellow or Associate or Licentiate of the Royal Institute of British Architects, or being a member of any one of the Allied Societies or of the Society of Architects or of the Ulster Society of Architects was at the passing of this Act in *bona fide* practice as an architect, or

(2) Has obtained by examination and holds a degree in architecture conferred by any University within the United Kingdom or has such other qualification as may be approved by the Board, or

(3) Proves to the satisfaction of the Board that at the passing of this Act he had been for at least two years engaged as a principal in the *bona fide* practice of architecture, or had served for ten years as pupil, apprentice, or assistant, or partly as one and partly as the other, to a person or persons who at the passing of this Act is or are entitled to be enrolled under this Act.

3. Subject to the provisions of Section two of this Act no person shall be entitled to be enrolled as an architect unless he has served as apprentice or assistant, or partly as one and partly as the other, for not less than five years with a person enrolled or entitled at the passing of this Act to be enrolled under this Act, and has passed and produces or transmits to the Registrar a certificate under the seal of the Board that he has passed such examinations as to his knowledge of architecture, and of the practice and duties of an architect, as the Board shall from time to time prescribe. Provided always that any person who shall have at any time passed all the examinations required to be passed for membership of the Institute shall, subject to the provisions of this Act, be entitled to enrolment without further examination.

4. From and after the passing of this Act the Administrative Board of Architecture shall consist of (A) the Council of the Royal Institute of British Architects as annually elected together with those Presidents of Societies allied to the Institute who may not have been elected on the Council, provided they be Fellows of the R.I.B.A.; (B) one person if nominated by the Society of Architects, one person if nominated by the Ulster Society of Architects (so long as these two Societies remain as independent bodies not allied or incorporated with the R.I.B.A.), and such other persons not exceeding ten in number as may be nominated by such other bodies as the Privy Council shall from time to time determine.

The first members of the Board included under (B) shall sit for two years, after which time four of such members shall retire annually, the order of retirement to be determined by ballot, but any person so retiring shall be eligible for re-election. The President of the Board shall always be the acting President of the R.I.B.A. Any vacancy among the persons nominated in Class (B) occurring by resignation or death shall be filled up by the body nominating such persons.

5. The duties and powers of the Board shall be as follows:—

(1) To frame rules—

(A) Regulating their own proceedings;  
(B) Prescribing the examinations entitling to enrolment.

(2) To issue and cancel certificates.

(3) To decide upon the removal from the roll of the name of any enrolled architect liable to be removed from the roll under the provisions of this Act, and also to decide upon the restoration to the roll of the name of any architect so removed; and generally do any other act or duty which may be necessary for the due and proper carrying out of the provisions of this Act so far as they relate to the Board.

Rules framed under this section shall be valid only if approved by the Privy Council.

6. A roll shall be kept by the Board subject to the provisions of this Act and to any rules for the enrolment of architects made in pursuance of this Act. Such roll shall contain in one list all architects who are enrolled under this Act and any rules hereunder, and shall be in the form given in Schedule A with such variations as may be required.

7. The Board shall cause a correct copy of the roll to be once in every year printed under their direction and published and placed on sale. A copy of the roll for the time being purporting to be so printed and published shall be admissible as evidence of all matters stated therein, and the absence of

the name of any person from the roll shall be evidence, until the contrary is made to appear, that such person is not enrolled in pursuance of this Act.

8. The Board shall appoint a Registrar, who shall keep the roll in accordance with the provisions of this Act, and any rules hereunder.

9. The Board may direct the Registrar not to enrol any person who is proved to the satisfaction of the Board—

(1) To have been convicted in His Majesty's dominions or elsewhere of any offence which if committed in England would be a felony or misdemeanour, or to have been declared by any court of competent jurisdiction to have committed any fraud; or

(2) To have been guilty of disgraceful professional conduct. Provided that such person shall receive one month's notice of the charge brought against him, and have an opportunity of defending himself from the same.

10. The Registrar shall remove a name from the roll in the following cases:—

Removal of names and alteration of roll.

(1) At the request or with the consent of the person whose name is removed;

(2) When the enrolled person is dead;

(3) When required so to do by the Board; and shall from time to time insert in the roll any alteration which may come to his knowledge in the name or address of any person enrolled.

In the execution of these duties the Registrar shall in each case act upon such evidence as appears to him sufficient.

11. The Board may direct the Registrar to remove from the roll the name of any person enrolled in the following cases:—

Removal of names of convicted persons, &c.

(1) Where it is proved to the satisfaction of the Board to have been incorrectly or fraudulently entered;

(2) Where any person enrolled shall be convicted in His Majesty's dominions or elsewhere of any offence which if committed in England would be a felony or misdemeanour or to have been declared by any court of competent jurisdiction to have committed any fraud;

(3) Where, after due inquiry, it is proved to the satisfaction of the Board that the person enrolled has been guilty of disgraceful professional conduct;

(4) Where a person having been enrolled under this Act shall be found by the Board to have entered into or begun to follow any other business or occupation which in the opinion of the Board is inconsistent with that of an architect.

Provided always that before any person's name shall be removed from the roll upon any of the grounds specified in this section, such person shall have one month's notice of the proposal to remove his name from the roll and the grounds thereof, and shall have an opportunity of showing cause against such removal.

12. Any person thinking himself aggrieved by any decision of the Board refusing him enrolment or directing the removal of his name from the roll of architects may appeal therefrom to the High Court of Justice within three months after the notification of such decision to him, but no further appeal shall be allowed.

Appeal from decision of Administrative Board.

13.—(1) Where a name has been removed from the roll at the direction of the Board the name of the person shall not again be entered in the roll except by order of the Board.

Restoration of names removed.

(2) The Board may in any case in which they think fit restore to the roll such name removed therefrom, either without fee or on payment of such fee not exceeding the enrolment fee as the Board may from time to time fix, and the Registrar shall restore the name accordingly.

(3) The name of any person removed from the roll at the request or with the consent of such person shall, unless it might if not so removed have been removed by the direction of the Board, be restored to the roll by the Registrar on the application of such person, and on payment of such fee not exceeding the enrolment fee as the Board shall from time to time fix.

14. Such reasonable fees shall be paid in respect of the several matters and at the times and in the manner set forth in Schedule B to this Act as the Privy Council may from time to time by order signed

Fees

## Application of Fees.

## Penalty for obtaining a certificate by false representation.

## Penalty for wilful falsification of roll.

## Scale fees.

## Act not to apply to naval architects.

## Interpretation.

by the Clerk to the Privy Council direct and fix, with a view to meeting the expenses incurred by the Board and the Institute in the administration of this Act.

15. All fees paid under or by virtue of this Act shall be paid to the Institute, and such fees shall be applied as follows:—

(1) In payment of all expenses incurred by the Board connected with the examination and enrolment and removal of persons enrolled or applying to be examined or enrolled under this Act;

(2) In payment of the general expenses of the Board and the Institute in connection with and incidental to the provision and maintenance of the roll and the administration of this Act;

(3) In promoting and facilitating the acquirement of the knowledge of such of the various arts and sciences connected with Civil Architecture as the Institute may from time to time determine.

The Institute shall, as soon as practicable after the thirty-first day of December in each year, publish a financial statement made up to that date showing the receipts and expenditure including liabilities of the Board and the Institute under this Act during the year, which statement shall be certified as correct by an accountant who shall be a Chartered Accountant.

16. Any person who procures, or attempts to procure, himself to be enrolled under this Act by making or producing, or causing to be made or produced, any false or fraudulent representation or declaration, either verbally or in writing or otherwise, and every person aiding and assisting him therein, shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanour in England or Ireland, and in Scotland of a crime or offence punishable by fine or imprisonment, and shall on conviction thereof be sentenced to be imprisoned for any term not exceeding twelve months.

17. Any person wilfully making, or causing to be made, any falsification in any matter relating to the Roll of Architects shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanour in England or Ireland, and in Scotland of a crime or offence punishable by imprisonment, and shall on conviction thereof be sentenced to be imprisoned for any term not exceeding twelve months.

18. From the date of this Act coming into operation—

(1) The charges for professional services to be made by an architect enrolled under this Act shall in the absence of agreement be the charges of which particulars are contained in the Schedule of Charges of the Royal Institute of British Architects, with such changes as may from time to time be made by that Institute and sanctioned by the Privy Council.

(2) No person other than a person enrolled and holding a practising certificate granted under the provisions of this Act shall be entitled to practise as an architect, or to recover the above or any charges for services rendered in the capacity of architect.

Provided that nothing herein contained shall prejudice the right of professional members of the Institution of Civil Engineers or Surveyors' Institution to recover charges for work of any kind falling within the duties of their respective callings.

19. Nothing in this Act respecting architects shall apply to persons practising as naval architects.

20. In this Act—

The term "the Council" means the Council of the Institute.

"The Institute" means the Royal Institute of British Architects, incorporated by Royal Charters, 7 Wm. IV. and 50 Vict. and 8 Edward VII.

The "Allied Societies" means the following Institutes, Societies, and Associations, viz.:

Royal Institute of Architects of Ireland.

Manchester Society of Architects.

Nottingham and Derby Architectural Society.

Leeds and Yorkshire Architectural Society.

Birmingham Architectural Association.

York and Yorkshire Architectural Society.

Leicester and Leicestershire Society of Architects.

Glasgow Institute of Architects.

Bristol Society of Architects.

Sheffield Society of Architects and Surveyors.

Aberdeen Society of Architects.

Edinburgh Architectural Association.

Northern Architectural Association.

Liverpool Architectural Society.

Devon and Exeter Architectural Society.

Dundee Institute of Architects.

South Wales Institute of Architects.

Northamptonshire Association of Architects.

Hampshire and Isle of Wight Association of Architects, and such other Institutes, Societies and Associations in the United Kingdom as shall from time to time be allied to the Institute under the provisions in that behalf contained in the Charter and By-laws of the Institute.

"Architect" means a person enrolled under this Act;

"Board" means the Administrative Board of Architecture created by this Act.

21. This Act may be cited as the Architects Act, 19

It shall come into operation on the      day of      One thousand nine hundred and

Short title  
and com-  
mencement.

**SCHEDULE A.**

Name.	Address.	Date of Roll.	How Admitted.	Designation and Distinctions.

**SCHEDULE B.**

Nature of Fee.	When to be paid.	To whom to be paid.
For enrolment of name of architect under provisions of Section 2.	On application and before enrolment.	To the Registrar at the Institute.
For enrolment of name of any person other than as above.	Ditto.	Ditto.
Annual fee to be paid by every enrolled architect taking out a practising certificate.	On or before November 30 of each year in respect of the year commencing January 1 following.	Ditto.
On entry of any candidate for final qualifying examination.	At time of entering.	Ditto.
On entry of any candidate for any examination other than as above.	Ditto.	Ditto.

**APPENDIX F.**

**PRÉCIS OF REPLIES RECEIVED FROM THE COUNCILS OF THE ALLIED SOCIETIES.**

**THE ABERDEEN SOCIETY OF ARCHITECTS.**—The Council expressed general approval of the draft Registration Bill as embodied in the Report.

**THE BIRMINGHAM ARCHITECTURAL ASSOCIATION.**—The Council are of opinion that it appears inadvisable to proceed with the presentation of the Registration Bill in view of the advice received as to the remote chance of its becoming law and the expense entailed.

**THE BRISTOL SOCIETY OF ARCHITECTS.**—Having regard to all the circumstances, the best course to adopt will be that suggested in Section 5, Sub-section (2), of the Interim Report.

**THE DEVON AND EXETER ARCHITECTURAL SOCIETY.**—The Council have passed the following Resolution: "This Society recommends that the suggestion on page 2, Sub-section 5 (B) (1), of the Interim Report of the Registration Committee be furthered, subject to a General Conference of kindred Societies and Professions, with a view to joint action."

**THE DUNDEE INSTITUTE OF ARCHITECTS.**—The Council have not yet completed their consideration of the Report.

THE EDINBURGH ARCHITECTURAL ASSOCIATION.—The Council have not yet completed their consideration of the Report.

THE GLASGOW INSTITUTE OF ARCHITECTS.—The Council have passed the following Resolution: "That, while thoroughly approving of the proposal contained in the draft Registration Bill, and desirous that the R.I.B.A. should keep the objects thereof steadily in view and use all feasible means of advancing the scheme, they consider, in view of the opinion given by the Parliamentary Agent and Solicitors, that the present is not an opportune time to promote the Bill before Parliament."

THE HAMPSHIRE AND I. W. ASSOCIATION OF ARCHITECTS.—The Council agree that a scheme of Registration is most desirable and that this should be inaugurated under the auspices of the R.I.B.A.

THE LEEDS AND YORKSHIRE ARCHITECTURAL SOCIETY.—The Council agree with the Report as to the present position, but, in their opinion, the general feeling of this Society would be unanimously in favour of the work being continued now that so much has been done, and the Royal Institute is considered to be pledged to do this.

THE LEICESTER AND LEICESTERSHIRE SOCIETY OF ARCHITECTS.—The Council hope that the Bill will be presented to Parliament at as early a date as possible. It would be wise, without further loss of time, to approach the kindred Societies and the various Government Departments interested in building in order to ascertain their views on this matter.

THE LIVERPOOL ARCHITECTURAL SOCIETY.—The Council have not yet completed their consideration of the Report.

THE MANCHESTER SOCIETY OF ARCHITECTS.—Whilst the Council are of opinion that a Registration Bill is desirable, it is felt, in view of the difficulties surrounding the matter as expressed in the R.I.B.A. Registration Committee's Report, that it is better not to proceed with the proposed Registration Bill, but rather to obtain a new Charter on the lines laid down in Paragraph 5, Section (b), Clause 2, of the Interim Report of the Registration Committee dated 28th March 1913. In addition, this Council thinks it desirable that the draft Registration Bill, as prepared, be submitted to the members of the R.I.B.A. and settled ready for submission to Parliament when the Council of the R.I.B.A. shall think fit.

THE NOTTINGHAM ARCHITECTURAL SOCIETY.—The best course to adopt is to follow the advice of the Solicitors and the Parliamentary Agent of the Institute on page 4, Appendix C, Clause 4 A, "To invite a General Conference of kindred Societies and Professions with a view to preliminary or joint action."

THE NORTHERN ARCHITECTURAL ASSOCIATION.—This Council is of opinion that a Registration Bill is necessary. In view, however, of the difficulties of obtaining the Bill as explained in the Report of the Registration Committee, the Council agree that an application be made to the Privy Council for a new Charter. The Council are further of opinion that the granting of a new Charter should be only the preliminary to the active promotion of a Registration Bill.

THE NORTHAMPTONSHIRE ASSOCIATION OF ARCHITECTS.—The Council do not consider it advisable to proceed with the Registration Bill.

THE ROYAL INSTITUTE OF THE ARCHITECTS OF IRELAND.—The Council are in favour of the Bill being passed, subject to such modifications as may be considered desirable and necessary.

THE SHEFFIELD SOCIETY OF ARCHITECTS.—The Council considers that under the circumstances mentioned in the Interim Report of the Registration Committee it is not desirable to proceed further with a Registration Bill at the present time.

THE SOUTH WALES INSTITUTE OF ARCHITECTS.—The Council have not yet completed their consideration of the Report.

THE YORK AND YORKSHIRE ARCHITECTURAL SOCIETY.—The Council, although not wishing to urge the R.I.B.A. to proceed with the Bill against the advice of their experts, unanimously agree with its principles. If the General Body desire to proceed with the Bill the Council of this Society would support their decision.

DISCUSSION ON THE REPORT AND RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE COUNCIL IN REGARD  
TO THE STATUTORY REGISTRATION OF ARCHITECTS, AT THE SPECIAL  
GENERAL MEETING HELD MONDAY, 1ST DECEMBER 1913.

Mr. REGINALD BLOMFIELD, A.R.A., *President*, in the Chair.

THE PRESIDENT: The importance of this meeting and of this business is shown by the large attendance here to-night. It is a question which affects architects all over the country. It has hung over the Institute and divided our counsels for something like twenty-five years. I shall not delay you long with introductory remarks, but I would like to remind some of our members, and especially the younger ones, of the amount of time and thought and anxious consideration which members have given to this question. I find, on the figures which the Secretary has been good enough to collect for me, that the question of the registration of architects first came before us officially in 1887. Registration Bills were brought forward in 1888, 1889, 1891, 1893, 1895, and 1900. They all failed, and their failure was due largely to the Opposition of the Royal Institute, whose members felt that these Bills were inadequate, unsatisfactory, and impracticable. (Hear, hear.) With 1900 closed what you might call the first phase of the question. The question again became a burning one, and after various vicissitudes a Bill was brought forward by the Council of the Institute in 1905 which did not meet with the full acquiescence of the general body. There were provisions in it which they disliked, and which many of them have continued to dislike. This created a good deal of difference of opinion amongst our members, and at about that time, under the Presidency of Mr. John Belcher, a serious and very earnest attempt was made at compromise. It was endeavoured to reconcile all the various shades of opinion and try to arrive at some *via media* which would meet all our varying points of view. A compromise was, in fact, unanimously arrived at in 1907. From then till 1910 and afterwards your Council endeavoured to realise the provisions of that compromise. In 1910, not exactly a fresh departure was made, but the boundary of this enterprise was enlarged in so far as an attempt was made to conciliate everybody; and as part of that conciliation members of the Society of Architects were to be brought into the Institute on condition that the Bill was to be a penalising Bill. These proposals were brought before the general body, and in January 1912 the general body expressed their disapproval of them, and the whole question was referred back to the Council for further consideration. With that resolution of January 1912 we began what I think is the third phase of this question. The Council of the Institute at once appointed a large and representative Committee to consider the whole question of registration, and also the best method of going forward in the matter. They also appointed a Constitutional Committee to consider what effect this or any other registration scheme would have on the constitution of the Institute, and they sent out inquiries to all the Allied Societies to ascertain their opinion on the matter. This brings us down to the present time, and to the Report and the Recommendations which you have in your hands. Now, gentlemen, I ask you to consider what is the present position, as to which you have had concise information in the Report which has been circulated with this notice. The position, shortly, is this. Our expert advisers tell us that under the present circumstances there is an extremely small chance for a considerable

time of a Registration Bill being placed on the Statute Book. They also advise us that the effort to do so would involve us in very considerable expense. We also find that though some of our Allied Societies are in favour of going forward with the Registration Bill, others are against it. Therefore there is a serious division of opinion on that matter. And in the third place we meet with a serious constitutional difficulty, because it is obvious that a Registration Bill must affect all classes who are connected with the Institute. And yet one of our classes is, by the Constitution, debarred from giving any expression of opinion on this matter. We are, therefore, in regard to proceeding directly to a Registration Bill, practically in an *impasse*. Your Council have given all these factors of the question most careful and anxious consideration, and the result they have arrived at is the alternative, the second of the two courses that were suggested to you by your Registration Committee, that we should proceed by way of a New Charter. (Applause.) They think that this course will give us that differentiation between the qualified and the unqualified man, and that public recognition of our status, which have been the principal objects of all schemes for registration. I may point out further that, in the opinion of your Council, such a course as this is a necessary preliminary to any further proceedings and action, to any endeavour to promote a Registration Bill in Parliament if such action becomes necessary in the future. And, lastly, they feel that this course will, if adopted, unite all the scattered units of our profession and make it what it ought to be, a great and compact profession. (Applause.) Gentlemen, I have endeavoured to lay before you, as briefly as I can, what is the position. There are just one or two remarks that I would like to make to you in my personal capacity, not in the least as occupying the Chair which I have the honour to occupy, but simply as a member of the Institute. I have been told that my own personal attitude in this matter has been supposed to be hostile on this question. I may tell you, gentlemen, that it is nothing of the sort. (Hear, hear.) I say, in order to put a stop to any such foolish rumours, that it is nothing of the sort, because I am convinced by the logic of facts, whatever one may have thought twenty years ago, that some organisation of our calling is necessary. (Applause.) And personally I am entirely in favour of it, and I am now speaking as one of the votaries in this room, as an individual member of the Institute. I am in favour of this scheme because I hope it may settle this great and burning question which is before us every year, and I hope that if we can arrive at a settlement and determine the policy which is to govern our action in this matter, it will free us for activities in other directions which are very urgently needed. (Applause.) I would say also that this Report is not to be taken in detail; it is merely a statement of a general policy; the details will, of course, have to be most carefully considered at a later stage if the general policy is adopted. That is all I have to say, except that we have a great deal to discuss, and I urge all gentlemen who will speak to-night to keep as closely to the point as they can, and not to say more than is necessary to make their point clear. (Applause.) In order formally

to introduce the discussion, I shall call upon Mr. Peach to move the adoption of the Report and Recommendations, and Mr. Gammell to second it. (Applause.)

MR. STANLEY PEACH (*F.*), in formally moving the adoption of the Report and Recommendations of the Council, said: I am deputed to lay fully before the meeting the steps which the Registration Committee have taken in the course of their investigations and which ultimately caused the Council to arrive at the suggestion of policy contained in their Recommendations. The President has stated in the Opening Address of the Session that the question was intricate and difficult, and had occupied the attention of the profession for over thirty years. As a matter of fact, it went back further than that, for the necessity of conferring a "Hall Mark" upon the duly qualified man to prevent confusion in the public mind was present in the minds of those who founded the Institute. In considering the question before the Meeting it is necessary to remember that the Institute is of a dual nature. It is a club, and as a club it is competent for the members to have distinctions among themselves and to draw up rules or to make regulations for the management of the members in using the club. But it has a greater function. It is a public body empowered by the King in Council to foster and encourage Architecture, and in every action taken by the Institute its constitution and function to act in the public interest must never be lost sight of. The policy must be based on public policy. A general "Hall Mark" of Chartered Architect, if adopted, would enable the public to easily distinguish qualified architects from those who merely used the title Architect, and thus present misunderstandings would be removed. The opinion of the Institute has always been that the qualified architect is one who, having natural artistic ability and an instinct for construction, has developed these natural gifts to the best advantage by judicious education, and by doing so has fitted himself to be a valuable public servant. This development was part of the work which the Institute is empowered to do by Charter, and the number of men who at the present time hold a Diploma of qualification granted by the Institute is conclusive evidence that the work has been thoroughly well done. At the outset the Registration Committee found itself hampered by the mandate of the Institute given in 1906 and confirmed in 1907, namely, that Parliamentary recognition should be confined to its own membership.\* That, in effect, is to ask Parliament for a monopoly which is inconsistent with the prevailing opinion of the present day, and our Parliamentary and legal advisers consider that it is impracticable. Their advice was given after careful consideration and exhaustive discussion of the subject with the Registration Committee and its delegates. The whole case of Registration submitted to our advisers was prepared by the Secretary of the Institute from its records, and this, together with the Bill of 1905 (although previously rejected by the Institute), was sent to the solicitors. It may be argued that as the question so the answer will be, but the reply in this instance is a notable exception to this general rule. The answer obviously invited was to advise the Institute to proceed with a Bill. But this was not the reply received. The difficulties were pointed out and the Committee were advised that the present was not a favourable time to promote a Bill, and that the mandate of the Institute was not suitable material upon which to frame a Bill, and that if a Bill for Registration was to be drafted it should be on a wider basis, and the Bill of

\* See JOURNAL R.I.B.A. 7th April 1906 and 9th March 1907.

1905 was recommended as a suitable measure of this kind if brought up to date. In the face of this advice the Registration Committee might at once have reported to the Council that it was impossible to go on. They considered that this would be merely waste of time, and that it would be better to consider the Bill of 1905† with a view to eliminating features of the Bill which were considered objectionable and which had caused it to be rejected by the Institute. The Committee found it impossible to remove entirely the objectionable features, with the result that the Bill which is referred to in its Report does not differ substantially from the Bill of 1905, the terms of which are well known to all of us.‡ The solicitors recommended the Committee to consider the public case; and here again the Committee were face to face with a difficulty, because an institution which is empowered by Charter to do certain work must experience great difficulty in changing the source of its authority unless it can be shown that the power which it has is insufficient, and that the authority originally granting the authority is unable to remedy the defects. In the case of this Institute there is no evidence (as far as we have gone) that the Chartered power has been insufficient or that the further powers required in the public interest cannot be obtained by Charter. This is not merely our solicitors' advice, but it is the general opinion of those who are conversant with these matters and with Parliamentary procedure. It cannot be said that in the past the Institute has failed to make the best use of the powers entrusted to it, when we remember that in or about the year 1884 the Institute had only about 1,000 members, and that to-day, if we include members of Allied Societies, there are some 7,000 members of the profession more or less under its control. The majority of these men have been examined by the Institute and found qualified to carry on the work of the Institute in advancing that great national asset "Architecture." We must bear in mind that an architect is not only an artist, a designer, and a scientific man giving service for a reward to an individual. He acts also as a winnowing machine, and in the course of his practice separates the wheat from the chaff throughout the wide field of industrial and commercial activity concerned with the Building Trade throughout this country. There is conclusive evidence in the cottage, in the school, in the factory, and in all the public and private buildings of the United Kingdom that the members of the Institute deemed qualified by the Institute have efficiently performed this work in the service of the public, and that all classes of the public have derived substantial benefits from their work. It is to the public interest that the "Hall Mark" of the men who are competent to make selection in this way should be perfectly clear, otherwise there will be confusion in the public mind and the work will suffer by falling to a great extent into unqualified hands. Probably artists will always have distinctions among themselves, but these domestic distinctions should not be allowed to interfere with the general "Hall Mark" which is required for the guidance of the public. Unless it is perfectly clear to the public, the principal advantage of Registration is missed. In the performance of its public duty it is possible that individual members may at times suffer, but that is almost inevitable in any great public work for public benefit.

† For Draft Bill 1905 see JOURNAL 22nd July 1905, page 585.

‡ The objectionable features are mentioned in the Report of the Registration Committee printed in the JOURNAL 9th March 1907.

It is not a real hardship in the end, because if the cause is great and of sufficient importance to justify exceptional treatment of practitioners, and our efforts are directed to advance the work itself, it will act like a magnet, and as the cause advances in public estimation it will assist the members far more than anything which can be done for members as individuals. In considering the Report and Recommendations we should therefore concentrate upon the public point of view. In such a case we need not be too modest. I think we are entitled to say that the work of the architect of to-day, by reason of the work which this Institute has done under the powers conferred upon it by the King, will compare favourably with the work of any architects of the past. This is largely due, in the first instance, to the "Hall Mark" conferred by the Institute under the Charter of 1837, which recognised the "Members" of the Institute, and it was this distinction then conferred which first enabled the public to distinguish clearly between the qualified and the unqualified practitioners. So far as the public are concerned one "Hall Mark" to all is the ideal system of Registration, and I do not think that we shall ever improve upon it. The members of the Institute were, it is true, divided among themselves into Fellows and Associates, but to the public they were all members alike. About the middle of last century the distinction between Fellows and Associates was gradually emphasised in the eyes of the world, and the public advantage of a simple and unmistakable "Hall Mark" was lost sight of. There is abundant evidence to show that by reason of this division of our membership the public were confused and the cause of Architecture suffered. It is well known that the older man claimed that he was the superior by reason of his age and experience, and the younger man claimed that he was the superior because the older man had obtained his diploma by mere effluxion of time, while he, the younger man, had obtained his as the result of the better use which he had made of his time. These statements were made for self-preservation, and were the inevitable and the direct outcome of the undesirable distinctions which had been introduced into our ranks. In spite of our experience later on we made a third distinction by the creation of the Licentiate class, and imposed even more severe restrictions on that class than the Associates had to endure when their class was first formed. The disabilities of the Associates have been gradually removed by continuous agitation, and not from a sense of justice, as they should have been. It would have been far more dignified and better for the profession to have given way from the highest motives instead of in the end yielding to force that which was justified by reason. The Recommendations of the Council are directed to avoid repetition of these mistakes and to prevent discord in our ranks. You are asked to-day to grant the Licentiates that which in the end the Institute was compelled to concede to the Associates, but to a far less extent. Over 2,000 men have been drawn into this Institute as Licentiates, and have been placed under permanent disabilities. They are unable to express any opinion or to vote upon matters which vitally affect the means whereby they earn their daily bread and which affect their professional reputation and status. The Council desire to give them reasonable means of having at least a voice in these matters, and also to remove the last of the disabilities attached to the Associates; and if there is any real hardship in these proposals it falls on the Fellows rather than the Associates. The Fellows are asked to deal generously with the Associates, and the Fellows and Associates to extend a like generous treatment to the Licentiates. The Council believe

that there is a desire for further information on this subject, but in the Report which is before you everything which is really pertinent to the issue is stated. The condensed statement of the facts which appears in the Report will necessarily be amplified as the details are discussed, and members will find that we are really face to face with a choice between proceeding on the lines recommended by the Council or altering the principles which up to the present time have governed the policy of this Institute. They must go further than the Institute has hitherto shown itself willing to go. That is the issue which is before us, and upon which we shall have to express an opinion to-night. I beg to propose the adoption of the Report and Recommendations, and to ask Mr. Gammell to second it.

Mr. K. GAMMELL [A.]: Mr. President and Fellow Members,—You have listened to the speech of the gentleman who has moved the adoption of these proposals, and I believe I shall have the concurrence of everyone in this room when I offer the opinion that to be called upon to follow such a speaker is in the nature of a thankless task. That being so, my feelings are distinctly of a mixed nature. I am, of course, grateful to Mr. Peach for saving me from the responsibility of amplifying the statement issued by the Council with regard to these proposals, but, on the other hand, I feel that I owe him no thanks, because, so far as my limited intelligence permits me to see, he has placed me in a position bordering dangerously upon the superfluous. As I apprehend it, the duties of a seconder to any resolution are, to put it in metaphor, to gather up the loose ends of the warp and woof of his remarks, in order that it may be presented to the meeting as a complete garment, with the eventual idea of its being torn to pieces by the meeting in order to test the genuineness and the value of the materials which compose it. That, I think, is the right conception of the duties of a seconder. By reason of the thoroughness of Mr. Peach's remarks, that is not possible for me to do, because, honestly, I can think of nothing to add in the way of new matter, or which can be claimed to break new ground. And it would seem to me that the only claim I have on the attention of this meeting is if I can advance anything which I think will be helpful to the meeting to enable it to approach the consideration of the matter in the proper way. I believe, gentlemen, that I can, and that being so, with your concurrence I want to put one or two points before you as representing the particular reasons why you should give these proposals your very careful consideration, and, I hope, your eventual concurrence, if not to-night, then on some future occasion. In jotting down these notes I should like to explain that I have not placed them in what I regard as any order of merit or value. It must be obvious to the meeting that a newly joined, or recently joined, Associate could not approach this matter in quite the same way as a Fellow, but I hope the consensus of opinion in this room, either to-night or on some future occasion, will be in favour of the acceptance of these proposals, and I also go further and offer the opinion that the only proper way to regard these proposals is not from the personal point of view, but with the largest possible outlook. (Hear, hear.) What is this going to do for our Institute, which we have all worked for, and which we all respect and—I shall use a term which I hope you will not object to—love? I hope that will not be misinterpreted. I love this Institute. I have put up a good fight on many occasions, and I hope to do so again, and what I want members to do, if they will forgive me for taking up the attitude of the heavy father, is to look at it and see what advan-

tage your sons, and, I hope, my son, will derive if we make the sacrifices which we are asked for to-night. There is no doubt we are asked to make sacrifices, and the question is, Are we prepared to make them? The first point I have in my notes deals with one certain matter, as to why I think these proposals are worthy of very careful consideration; and that is because you know these emanate from the most absolutely out-and-out Registrationist Council which members have ever voted into a position of power and responsibility. I do not say it is absolutely out-and-out Registrationist, but I can say without fear of contradiction that at least 75 per cent. of the members who form your Council now and your Constitutional Body are Registrationists. I venture to think that is a point which should be carefully and clearly borne in mind. Secondly, they represent no sudden resolve of a newly-elected Council or Committee, anxious, to use an American expression, to "make good." Two years have gone by before you have had this matter to consider, and therefore I want you to recollect that this is no sudden panic, no death-bed repentance, but that these proposals have been laid before you because they have been most carefully, thoroughly, and conscientiously thought out. Also I might add that the members forming those Committees and your Council have never been in the slightest doubt why they were sent there to represent you. That is a side-issue, but one which I think you should remember. Thirdly, despite the fact that these proposals are aimed at eventual registration, yet they are of such a nature as to commend themselves to those who hitherto have in Committee and in Council been opposed to our views. That, I think, is a very important point, because, setting aside for the moment the question of the Licentiate class, it is evident that if we are some day to secure registration, we must, so far as lies to our hands, do away with all this opposition. By these proposals, recollect, you have brought into line men who have hitherto kept studiously aloof from us, and who have even been a source of dissension within the Institute and Council. My fourth point is that the proposals offer the only means whereby any Bill promotable by the Institute can hope to be successful in Parliament. To make that statement clear, it is necessary to say this: It does not matter a rap how broad your Bill may be, if you cannot go to Parliament and say that it is promoted by an Institute every member of which has the opportunity, if he so desires, of making his voice or his opinions felt in general meeting, I believe I am within my right in saying that such a Bill is doomed to absolute failure. (Hear, hear.) I want you to get these points into your heads, because they are the points which we have thought over *ad nauseam*, if I may be permitted the expression. And now I shall divulge a State secret when I say that I, and many others with me, fought this idea of holding out privileges to the Licentiate class to the last ditch. I was at one of the Committees when they were discussing this, and it was only when we were, figuratively speaking, beaten to our knees that we at last gave in. But having given in, I for one am perfectly satisfied with these proposals; I think they offer the only possible solution at the present moment, and I shall not go back on that opinion. It is no use debating the matter with regard to the Licentiate class. You must recollect that the Licentiate class were brought in for specific purpose. Certain inducements were held out for them to come in, and by reason of that they naturally look to our Council and this Institute to do something to bear out their promise with regard to themselves, which was to go forward in the attempt to obtain registration. (Hear, hear.) I shall make another frank admission—though

I am afraid our President will not thank me for doing it. No one in this room fought the proposals for the inclusion of the Licentiate class within this Institute more whole-heartedly and more thoroughly than I did. But against my wishes they are included, and because they are included, and because I feel that the Institute owes them certain treatment, that we are obliged to bear out our promises to them if possible, I am whole-heartedly in favour of these proposals which have been laid before you this evening in the resolution which has been proposed by Mr. Peach. And that, I think, is a point which you should keep in mind, that we made certain promises and held out certain inducements to the Licentiate class, and they look to us to make good. Sixthly, I hold that these proposals are worthy of support, because they represent a distinct step forward. It is very easy, gentlemen, to offer criticism of a destructive kind, but I venture to think that the only criticism which is worth anything, and which will do our Institute the slightest good, is constructive criticism. Therefore, I would ask any gentleman who is not in agreement with these proposals, if he wishes to do his best for this Institute, that he will not destroy without setting up again. If any gentleman will bring forward a proposal to get over this difficulty better than the one which has been placed before you, I shall join issue, provided that I am satisfied that it is a tangible, a real, and a practicable suggestion. But after two years of some of the hardest work I have ever put into a Committee, I say that I do not think such a suggestion will be forthcoming. Should it be forthcoming, I will make good my statement. The last point I want to ask the careful consideration of this Institute to is this: Whether to-night you vote down this proposal, or whether this meeting be adjourned, or whether on some future occasion this proposal is voted down or is accepted, one fact will remain. If you vote it down, you will at any rate suggest, if you do not go to prove, that there is a distinct disinclination on the part of members to make sacrifices; and that being the case, I venture to offer the humble opinion that if we are not as a body prepared to make sacrifices, registration is absolutely impossible of attainment, and because I honestly think that, and because I honestly believe that this is the very best possible solution of the present difficulty, I am going to ask every one of my fellow Associates in this room to vote for the proposal when the opportunity arises. (Applause.)

Mr. S. DOUGLAS TOPLEY [L.] : I desire to move the following amendment:

"That in the opinion of this meeting of the R.I.B.A. it is undesirable to come to any decision in regard to the Report and Recommendations of the Council without further information; and in order to arrive at some definite policy in regard to future action, a further meeting should be called before the end of January next for the purposes suggested by the Registration Committee in Clause 5 of the Report of the 28th March 1913, and that with the notice of that meeting every member should receive from the offices of the Institute:

(a) A copy of the Bill as revised.

(b) Copies of the reports of the Solicitors and Parliamentary Agents, and

(c) Copies of the whole of the documentary evidence upon which these reports were based."

It might be an easier way to attempt to justify this resolution if I were to make one or two comments on the recommendation as it stands before us. Mr. Gammell has asked us to make our criticisms constructive rather than destructive. All will agree with him in that, but it must be borne in mind that the Institute has applied to

the Privy Council recently—four years ago only—for a New Charter, and I think that in criticising this we are entitled to ask those who recommend a New Charter to justify the result of what can be obtained. I would offer one or two criticisms on those lines, and in doing so I remind the meeting that I am only able to make those criticisms in the light of the information before us; it is possible that when further information is forthcoming, as I hope it will be before we come to a decision, it may be desirable to alter those opinions, and, if so, I shall do so without any sense of shame, even if it means reversing them altogether. I remind you that with the Report of the Registration Committee a draft Bill was submitted to the Council, and with that draft Bill the opinion that it went far beyond the policy laid down by the Institute in 1907, that it was not supported unanimously in Committee, would probably receive considerable opposition from the General Body, and there was very little chance of its becoming law in the future. Therefore the matter was referred to the Constitutional Committee, and, now, the Council bring forward an alternative policy—viz. to apply to the Privy Council for a New Charter. I draw attention to this point, that whereas the Committee recommend an application to the Privy Council for a New Charter as a substitute for registration, or as they say an alternative, yet, as far as I understand the Council's Report, they put it forward as a step towards registration. Now there is a wide difference between those two positions, and it is worth noting at the outset. (Hear, hear.) The proposal for a New Charter is put forward with the view of obtaining three distinct advantages: First, to secure for all qualified architects a public recognition of their qualification; secondly, to give them some substantial benefits; and thirdly, to remove the obstacles to further Parliamentary action. In the first place, with regard to the public recognition that is to be secured, I am reluctant to criticise any proposition the Council make; during the short time I have been a member I think I have shown my desire to meet the Council and support them wherever possible. But this proposal, to obtain the exclusive right to the term "Chartered Architect," will not secure recognition by the public. Fellows of the Surveyors' Institution who have the right to call themselves Chartered Surveyors with the same object are found not to do so, except in very few numbers. And I understand that those who do use the term find that even their own professional colleagues are unaware of what it means. (Laughter.) If I understand the position of the registrationists correctly, they do not claim that qualified architects should be recognised, but that unqualified architects should not be created in future. But that will not be secured by using the term "Chartered Architect," and if that is the only reason for approaching the Privy Council, I think it is a mistake to trouble the Privy Council in the matter. There is the question of substantial advantages. The benefits, I gather, are referred to in Clause 8, in which we are told "That the Royal Institute be empowered, subject to the approval of the Privy Council, to issue a scale of fees payable to Chartered Architects." I do not know whether fees based on such a scale would be recoverable at law, but even so it follows that the substantial character of the benefit depends on the scale. (Laughter.) I wish to hurry over the point because it is rather a sore one at present. During recent months we have held two meetings with the object of raising this scale, and not a sufficient number of members have attended to form a quorum. That does not seem a sufficient reason to approach the Privy Council. With regard to removing the obstacles, Clause 5

proposes to remove the disability imposed by previous Charters and By-laws on Associate members, and that all Chartered Architects by obtaining Associate rank of the Institute be permitted to vote on all matters connected with the management of the Institute, including the Charters and the By-laws. This would have some disadvantage as well as advantages, but on the whole there is no objection from my point of view as an Associate. But at the same time I do not think it is a matter which is of extreme importance at the present moment. Will you let me point out, with all respect to the Council, that if this is an obstacle, as we are advised it is by the Solicitors, the proper time to have removed it was in 1909, when the disabilities were precisely the same, and we were before the Privy Council and might have got a clause then without much trouble. (Hear, hear.) With regard to removing the disabilities on Licentiates, I do not know how far I shall be carrying the meeting with me, but the term "disability" in reference to Licentiates is singularly inappropriate. It seems to suggest they are a class who, but for some restrictive conditions in our Charter and By-laws, would be entitled to the full benefit of membership. That is not the case. In the Charter of 1909 the position of the Licentiate is stated clearly. On page 37 of the KALENDAR the Charter says: "A Licentiate shall not be a corporate member of the Royal Institute." That is an unfortunate position for Licentiates, of whom I desire to speak in terms of studied respect. But the Licentiate can overcome such disability, and he will be welcomed as a member of the Institute with open arms whenever he cares to avail himself of the opportunity which is presented to him twice a year of becoming fully qualified. (Loud applause.) Meantime the dignity and prestige of this Institute must be maintained, and the proper men to maintain it are those who have given some proof of their desire to take part in and further its objects by submitting to an examination. (Applause.) In becoming members of this Institute we undertook with open eyes certain definite responsibilities, and as responsible members of this Institute—and in this connection I see no reason to differentiate between the Fellows and the Associates—we did so knowing quite well that it would be a question of give all along the line and not take. We are willing and anxious to promote the objects of the Institute, and we are willing, as has been already suggested to us by Mr. Peach in moving the resolution—we are willing to make considerable sacrifices. But this is not altogether a question of the feeling between Licentiates and Associates. There is the position of the Institute to be considered, and I say we should not be loyal to this Institute in running away from our responsibilities to the extent of sharing them with men who would not associate themselves with us until the bar of an examination was withdrawn. Believe me, I am not speaking as an Associate who resents the ascendancy of the Licentiates—no one has ever heard me rant on that point, and never will—but we members who have the Institute's interests at heart should not, for the sake of registration or anything else, hand over any part of the control of the destinies of the Institute to those who would not join us two years ago when we stood in need of an increased membership unless we went out and carried them in. For those distinctive reasons, I am sorry to say I am opposed to the proposition before us; but, in the light of further information, I shall be glad to reconsider this, and I shall be glad, if I find I am wrong, to come here on a future occasion and affirm before you all that I have been talking nonsense this evening and have reconsidered my position. I know

I speak for others around me who occupy the same position, and who also want to do the right thing by the Institute in this matter. And I am willing to follow the Council and to support the Council in its recommendations up to a point. But I will not move in the dark. I want some light, and the light I ask for is contained in my amendment. One more point. If I am altogether wrong, and the meeting believes it will be advisable to go forward at once and obtain a New Charter, what will be the position? If we got a New Charter and remove obstacles which are in the way, we are at once up against Sections A and B, Clause 1, Appendix A—viz. that the principles of registration are not suitable material on which to frame a Bill. Please notice that this does not say that the position created by the Institute at the present moment has set up matters which prevent registration; it definitely says that in the judgment of the solicitors the established principles of registration are not suitable material on which to frame a Bill, and, further, if framed no public case can be made out in justification. Well, gentlemen, if the entire legal fraternity were to attend our meeting, and were to rise as one man and solemnly affirm that the established principles of registration are not suitable material on which to frame a Bill, as an artist and a citizen I should say they were all wrong, and I know that the principles of registration are proper material on which to frame a Bill. As to how they are to be framed, solicitors' opinion may be of some value, but when the solicitors tell us it is not proper material, I want to know what the Registration Committee have been telling our solicitors. And I submit it is essential we should have that information before coming to a conclusion on this matter. As I said before, we are most anxious—I am speaking for others as well as myself—to do the right thing by the Institute. We are not opposing this policy. I have offered some criticism on points which I wanted to bring forward, but we are not opposed to this proposition. We do want to have information which, as sane men, we can consider ourselves, to find out what it is that the Council adopts solicitors' advice upon with the view of taking future Parliamentary action which in Clauses A and B the same solicitors say will be entirely useless. I may be faulty in my reasoning—I think I must be (laughter)—but Mr. Peach, in his opening remarks, said, I think, that we had in this document all that was essential to the proper understanding of the question. They are not actually his words perhaps, but that is what he meant. With due respect to Mr. Peach, we have not. (Hear, hear.) And therefore I want every member to be supplied with the information mentioned in the amendment. (Hear, hear.) Several interesting items might well be included in this Report which are not included in it, and which have been given to us this evening in the speeches. But only those in this room have received that information. As we stand at the parting of the ways with regard to this Institute—because if this New Charter is formed we shall start on an entirely new basis for the future—I say as we stand at the parting of the ways I think every member of the Institute, whether he is likely to be interested in the matter or not, should have sufficient information on which to arrive at a proper conclusion. We shall probably be told it will be costly. I know it will be costly, but it will not be so costly as making a mistake. If that information is supplied to us, and a further meeting is held as soon as convenient, we shall be able to come to that meeting prepared to express an opinion on this matter in the light of the whole information on which such an opinion should be based.

Therefore, gentlemen, I beg to move the amendment which I have read out to you. (Loud applause.)

Mr. HERBERT A. WELCH [I.]: In seconding the amendment proposed by Mr. Topley I shall endeavour, as suggested by the President, to occupy as little of the time at the disposal of this meeting as possible. In speaking to the amendment, I shall neither applaud nor attack the Report, for it is clear that I must refrain from dealing with the subject of registration as such, except in so far as might be necessary to give effect to or emphasise any point that I feel is in need of emphasis—and here, Mr. President, I will ask you to bear with me if my remarks are not strictly within the purview of the resolution. There are many of us present here this evening—exactly how many will not be revealed until we vote—who feel that the time has arrived when some definite course must be decided upon and pursued in this matter of registration. There is, I think, also one thing at least upon which we are all agreed, and that is that the best interests of the Institute—with which, of course, is intimately connected the profession generally—lie very near our hearts. We, therefore, should be most anxious that the decision to be arrived at in connection with the Report will be one which is the result of the most careful consideration and deliberation on our parts. We are anxious, too, that this decision shall be both satisfactory and lasting. I should personally deplore that there might occur hereafter on this question the least cause for conflict within our ranks. I, therefore, ask the consideration of the members assembled here to-night for the amendment that I have the honour and pleasure to second. I submit that in order to arrive at a satisfactory and lasting decision on this question the time at our disposal to-night is inadequate. We should have all the evidence and documents before us for mature and deliberate consideration. This view I think you will find justified by the replies from the Councils of the Allied Societies given us on page 5. Let us consider them briefly in passing. We find that this subject is of such importance that the Societies' views are divided as follows: For the Council's proposals, 5; for the Registration Bill, 6. As I read it, two Societies are doubtful, and no less than five Societies have not yet completed their consideration of the Report. Now, Sir, these Societies have had the Report for consideration since April of this year. I assume that the Report of the Council, which we have before us, was in the printer's hands early in November, which would give the Societies six or seven months to arrive at a decision, and yet in five cases this has been found to be inadequate. Now, if this length of time has been inadequate for them to arrive at a satisfactory decision, how much more so is this the case with the members here to-night, who have but an hour or two at their disposal.

The PRESIDENT: We have since had two further communications, one from the Sheffield Society of Architects, saying that "under the circumstances mentioned in the Interim Report of the Registration Committee it is not desirable to proceed further with a Registration Bill at the present time." The other from the Northern Architectural Association, which says: "This Council is of opinion that a Registration Bill is necessary. In view, however, of the difficulties of obtaining the Bill as explained in the Report of the Registration Committee, the Council agreed that an application be made to the Privy Council for a new Charter. The Council are further of opinion that the granting of a new Charter should be only the preliminary to the active promotion of a Registration Bill."

Mr. WELCH, continuing: We look upon the Council as desirous of carrying out the wishes of the members, and their actions have hitherto justified our arriving

at this decision. I am sure that you have no desire to march onward without the whole-hearted support of the great majority of the members of the Institute. Believing this, as I do most sincerely believe it, I ask you to vote in favour of the amendment, which in substance means the postponement of this meeting for about two months, and which has for its purpose the more lengthy consideration of these proposals, in order that we might vote clearly and deliberately upon an issue of grave importance; and, since unity is strength, it will thereby enable us to give to you, Sir, and your colleagues a reply which will at once show clearly the road that it is thought best to follow, and I hope and trust that by voting in favour of the amendment it might have the result of procuring a united Institute at present fettered and weakened by dissensions within its ranks.

Mr. C. H. BRODIE [F.] : I take it for granted that there is no intention of forcing a decision on this matter to-night.

THE PRESIDENT : No; we are anxious to have it thoroughly discussed by all members of the Institute.

Mr. BRODIE : The remarks of the last gentleman seem to have very little bearing on the point.

THE PRESIDENT : I would not say that; but the Council have been extremely anxious to have all the cards on the table, and there is no desire to withhold any information. All that is desired will be forthcoming.

Mr. EDWIN T. HALL [F.] : I am sure we ought all to congratulate Mr. Peach and Mr. Gammell for the excellent speeches they have made in support of the proposition before us. They were on a high plane, and I feel it is the desire of every member at this meeting that we should look primarily to the advancement of architecture in anything we undertake or do. I do not propose to question the wisdom of the Council in proposing that an intermediate step should be taken with reference to the ultimate appeal to Parliament; I am not even prepared to say whether an appeal to Parliament is wise or unwise. But the Institute has at present decided that there shall be an ultimate appeal to Parliament, and this step, I understand, is a step taken with a view to that end. I should like to make this observation with regard to it: that one of the reasons given for this is, that the Licentiates are unable to express their opinion on this subject. I venture, with the greatest respect, to say that that is not accurate. The Licentiates have the right to the use of the Institute premises, they could always summon a meeting, and they could come to a resolution in favour of any policy which the Council might determine, or the reverse. Passing from that, I have not the remotest intention of opposing the proposals which the Council have laid before you; they have the responsibility, they have the wisdom, and they have had the facts before them; and they have come with a very considered judgment before you. But I do think it is desirable that we should see where these proposals will carry us. First of all, I want to clear the confusion of thought which is in the Registration Report before us. In several places it speaks of Licentiates as members of this Institute. I want to make it clear that they are not. The members of this Institute are the Fellows, the Associates, the Honorary Associates, the Honorary Fellows, and the Honorary Corresponding Members; those are the members of the Institute. If you refer to the Charter of 1909 you will see that the Licentiates are not members of the Institute at all. The Charter says: "A Licentiate shall not be a corporate member of the Royal Institute, nor shall he have any interest in or claim against the property of the Institute." The scheme before us is a scheme under various heads. It is, first, to give the title "Chartered Architect."

I want to draw the Council's attention to those who are excluded from the privileges of being called "Chartered Architect," if that is a privilege: it excludes all members of the Royal Academies of England, Ireland, Scotland and Wales. That, I think, is a grave omission. If the architects are to be embodied, we must incorporate the members of those distinguished Societies. It also excludes all members of the Society of Architects. I am not holding a brief—and I do not suppose there is anybody in this room who will think I do—for the Society of Architects. It also excludes all non-members of any societies who are practising as architects in this kingdom. I think those are very grave omissions, which should be remedied when the proposals come up. Resolution No. 2 is to give to Honorary Fellows, Hon. Associates, and Hon. Corresponding Members representation on the Council and Committees. That is an entirely new departure, and, I venture to think, a very dangerous one. These gentlemen are Royal Dukes, distinguished men of all sorts; they are not men who, from the nature of their position, should have any control whatever over the Institute. No. 3 is to make the Council the educational and examining body for all Chartered Architects in and out of the Institute. I think the Privy Council has no power to give a Charter to this Institute to control anybody who is not a member of this Institute; that can only be done by Act of Parliament. You will remember that it is proposed that there shall be a compulsory authority. Nothing but an Act of Parliament can give compulsory authority over any citizen who is not a member of the Institute. No. 5 is to remove all the disabilities of Associates. With respect to that, I only wish to say that this question was very thoroughly thrashed out in 1907. Whether or not the Associates should have the power to vote on certain questions is not the matter strictly before us. I am not opposing it, but I do wish to say that this was very carefully thrashed out so short a time ago as 1907. It was spoken against by Sir Aston Webb and many other members, and it was decided not. I am not saying the time may not now have come when that should be altered. With regard to the practical proposition that there should be more Associates on the Council, I would point out that that can be secured by bye-law; there is no necessity to get a Charter to increase the number of Associates on the Council. The gravest matter of all is that which is to remove all the disabilities of Licentiates. I have previously quoted the Charter. The disabilities of the Licentiates are, first, that they are not Corporate Members of the Royal Institute. The first thing, therefore, you are going to do is to remove that disability, and make them Corporate Members of the Royal Institute. ("No.")

THE PRESIDENT : To a very limited extent.

Mr. HALL : There are two propositions; first, to remove all the disabilities of the Licentiates, and second, that they are to be represented by one in ten.

THE PRESIDENT : That is very important.

Mr. HALL : The first is in the Report, and therefore I must deal with it. There is a second proposition which is contrary to that, and that is, that there shall be a one-in-ten election. The first proposition makes them Corporate Members of the Institute; it cannot do anything else. I want to say this, simply in order that we may clear the air, that we may see where it leads us. In the first place, it is a reversal of the educational policy of the Institute, in which you, Sir, have taken so prominent a part. It was decided, first of all, that no Associates should be admitted here except by examination. It was then decided that no Fellow should be elected except from that class, with the few exceptions

of distinguished men; and after 1913, this very year, no one should come into the Institute to Associate rank unless he had gone through a certain curriculum which is laid down here. It may be right or it may be wrong; but the fact remains that if these 2,100 gentlemen are made Corporate Members of this Institute, that policy is broken down at once in the very year when it was to have been tightened up. I want to draw your attention to this very grave change; it is a reversal of the policy which has been for twenty-five years earnestly pursued in this Institute. These 2,100 gentlemen have not complied with the educational tests which have been laid down. I was the author of the Licentiate class, and for years I proposed and urged it, and therefore nothing I say will be in the least degree disrespectful to it. But remember that the Associates very strongly opposed the creation of this class of Licentiates, because, they said, "If they once get in they will swamp us." I was a Vice-President, and I was in the chair, and with the authority of the Council I made this statement, that they were not to be Corporate Members of the Institute, and therefore they never could acquire the right to vote. That statement was made with the authority of the Council only four years ago. (Loud applause.) Now, Sir, if they are admitted, just consider the position. They are 2,100 strong; they could and would, in representing their interests, control the whole Institute; there is no class to compare with them; they number nearly as many as Associates and Fellows combined; there are 1,621 Associates, 851 Fellows—these figures are taken from the present *Kalendar*—and 2,079 Licentiates.

**THE PRESIDENT:** You know the voting capacity of the Licentiate class.

**Mr. HALL:** I am talking about their disabilities. If I were a Licentiate I should acquiesce in the proposals of the Council, notwithstanding the second proposal of the Council that only one Licentiate in ten should have the right of voting. If they are Corporate Members of this Institute, this is a mere fancy franchise, which could be got rid of immediately by appeal from the Licentiate class to the Privy Council. They would be nearly as numerous as the majority of the Institute: they would say to the Privy Council that it is wrong to restrict them to a voting power of one in ten, and the Privy Council would be compelled to listen to them, and would give them the right to vote. It is a very dangerous innovation. Again, Licentiates are to go on the Council. Unless they are made Corporate Members that is contrary to the principle of the whole of our Charters, which is that none but Fellows and Associates shall sit on the Council. It may be right that you should say, "No, we will extend that and create a new class and let them sit on the Council," but it involves their being Corporate Members to do it, and the principle which I have mentioned will have disappeared. Even in the case of Allied Societies it is an essential condition to their Presidents sitting on our Council that they shall be Fellows of the Institute, and it is only in the case of the Architectural Association that an Associate may sit on the Council as a representative of an outside body. We have been invited to give constructive criticism. I would venture to do so. If you wish that the Licentiates shall be brought into the Institute in the limited way in which I understand by the second proposal it is desired, we should follow the precedent set by the Royal College of Surgeons. They had outside members, and they decided to elect, in the course of one year, first 250, and in about eight or nine years afterwards they decided to elect all outside, the qualification being that they should have been in practice for fifteen years. That is a pre-

cedent which could be adopted here. Decide that a class shall be created which shall give a certain number of them, one in ten if you please, corporate rights in the Institute. The only danger you have then is that you are excluding the other members, and that is a grave difficulty. I do not want to oppose the general scheme, but I say that in view of the fact that Associates were persuaded to agree to this class because they were given the absolute assurance that the Licentiates should not have votes, you want to consider that very carefully before you pass this proposal. It may be in the wisdom of this Institute that this prohibition should be abrogated, but if it is, it should be frankly done by saying we withdraw the previous prohibition, and we think the time has come when these men should be introduced. (Applause.)

**Sir Aston WEBB, R.A., Past President:** I have taken part in many of the debates on this subject for about twenty-five years, I think; and so I could not help coming down to-night to join in what will probably be the last that I shall take part in. ("No, no.") What I feel is that to-night this question has been fairly debated on both sides, and I think we shall agree that what has been said against the Council's proposals has been said kindly and sincerely, and has been put before us in a clear and lucid way. The last time this subject came before us, two years ago, I unfortunately found myself opposed to what the Council proposed. (Hear, hear.) This time I confess I find myself in favour of their proposals, and I would ask the meeting to try and put aside the small details which Mr. Hall, for instance, with his extraordinary ability for analysing a report of this sort, has brought before us. I ask you to try and think of the main points in the Report. The whole thing is this: We have been asked to prepare if possible a scheme for the registration of architects, and that is what we know a large number of us wish to see, that architects should be registered by Parliament, and that nobody else except those who are so registered should be allowed to practise architecture or to call themselves architects. As far as I understand it—I have not the honour of being on the Council, but I have been on this Committee—the Council were prepared to advocate a Bill on those lines if it was possible. But in the first instance they very properly went to their legal advisers, not only to their Solicitors but to Parliamentary Counsel, and, as far as I understand it, Parliamentary Counsel did not say a Bill could not be framed—I think they were quite anxious—(laughter)—they gave me that impression—to frame one—and would have done so with pleasure; but when we pressed them as to the chances of that Bill they frankly said that at the present time it had no chance at all; with business as it is in the House of Commons, a private Bill of that sort would have no chance at all. (Hear, hear.) The most they could say was that if things altered it might have a "sporting chance." That is all that we could get out of them, out of gentlemen who, as I say, were extremely willing to propose the Bill. Then we considered whether it was worth while to go on, or whether we should try and take some intermediate step which would give, to some extent at any rate, what architects all over the country undoubtedly wanted. Had we not better try to obtain a step forward instead of waiting for this *will-o'-the-wisp* which we are told by those most anxious to forward it that there is no possible chance at the present time to get it? And I do hope that architects all over the country will realise that in the opinion of those who are best able to judge there is no reasonable possibility at the moment of getting Parliamentary sanction to what you want. And

these gentlemen put it very clearly to us; they said, "Of course we understand what you want; you want to be able to practise, and you want to prevent other fellows from doing so. That is clear. But before you can do that, before you will get Parliament to agree to that, to say that you, a certain number who have passed certain examinations, shall practise, and other men shall not, you must show in a definite way what they call a public case—viz. that it is for the public good that you should practise and others should not. That is really and truly the whole of the matter." And the ordinary sensible man said, "If that is so, if we cannot do that, can't we find some other means of at any rate getting something towards what our members want?" And the Committee went through that 1905 Bill item after item, and were always met with this difficulty—that Parliament will not grant you those penalising clauses which it includes. That, of course, is the difficulty, the penalising part of it. It seems to me perfectly understandable that Parliament could not agree that we should have this power and others should not. We looked about, and tried to find what other Societies had done, and we found that the Chartered Accountants, amongst others, had got a good deal of what they wanted under Charter. And our legal people said, "Don't you think that by Charter you can practically get what you want, with little delay, whereas with the other method it is uncertain whether you can ever get it?" It has been mentioned to-night that this chartered business is of no avail. Well, I saw the other day one of the most distinguished men in the Chartered Accountants' Institute, and I asked him how they found it answer there. He said, "We have a certain number who want this Parliamentary power to prevent other men practising, but our Council do not feel the necessity for it, because we find that all the important work—he gave me the figures—" is done by Chartered Accountants; no public company or public body would think of employing an accountant who was not a Chartered Accountant. And so it seemed to us," he said, "that this was the best thing we could do; though it would not prevent us going for complete registration at any time if we thought well." In the House of Commons there is talk of devolving work; there is to be "Home Rule all round," and the House of Commons will then have perhaps nothing to do; then we shall be able to get our Bill considered and, possibly, passed. I do not want to go into all the details of this matter; I am not enough behind the scenes in the Institute now to know the troubles that there may be behind some of these difficulties. But with regard to the Licentiate class as a whole, of course we know that if we got a Registration Bill we should have to sweep in everyone who made any pretence at practising as an architect; they would all come in and be registered architects. It is a very much smaller thing that is proposed here; we bring in our Licentiates, whom we have already brought in, to give them the right to be called architects. The Licentiate door is closed now; there will be no more coming in; it is only those who are in, and it is a comparatively small addition for the advantage which you gentlemen think would be accruing to us if we could have some distinguishing mark, such as Registered Architect, or Chartered Architect, or whatever name you like to give it; and that is the gist of the whole matter. It seems to me that our Institute would be wise to accept some proposal of this nature, and by all means have meetings to discuss such details as those which Mr. Hall has brought before us. They should be discussed and considered. But the gist of the thing is that we should go for registering the members of this Institute by Charter instead of

going to Parliament; let us do it ourselves, and I think we shall do it very much better. It is not wise to bind ourselves too much by Parliamentary Statutes. I say this is merely a step; but in the meantime, in order to do something, and to prevent these meetings year after year and doing nothing else, see if we cannot agree that the Institute shall try registering itself and its members, and so give the public some guarantee that the members of the Institute are men whom they may safely go to as appraisers in architectural matters. That is all we have to do; and I hope this meeting will not be drawn away by other methods, but that we shall try this experiment of acting for ourselves instead of going to Parliament, which, we are advised, would be hopeless.

Mr. G. A. T. MIDDLETON [A.]: May I bring this meeting back to the amendment? We have drifted from it. It is really the amendment which is in front of us, and I would draw the attention of this meeting to the fact that the amendment does not negative the original proposition; it only asks that information shall be given to us which we apparently are entitled to receive. The Report of the Registration Committee advises that this information should be given. If you look at Clause 5 you will see that it says that the members should be called together "To receive the reports of the Solicitors and Parliamentary Agent; to examine the Bill as drafted," and so on. The members ask under this amendment that the Report of the Registration Committee shall be adopted and that members shall be put in possession of all facts. (Hear, hear.) After that we may quite possibly agree to the suggestions of the Council, but it was for the members to consider whether some alternative course could be adopted. It was for them to consider first, not for the Council to go into details of an alternative course first. It may be sent back for the Council to prepare an alternative course, but the right thing this evening is to pass an amendment and for us to have a future meeting to consider the whole thing.

Mr. JOHN SLATER [F.]: I should have been quite content to remain a silent member this evening, but as you have called upon me, and as I acted at the request of the Council as Chairman of the Registration Committee, perhaps one or two words from me may not be useless. I am bound to say, looking back upon my membership of the Institute for a great many years, that I have listened to the discussion to-night with a certain feeling of despondency. I had thought that there was a certain amount of *esprit de corps* among us, and that there was a large body of feeling in the Institute in favour of registration. Well, I can say most honestly that the Registration Committee which was appointed went into the matter fully; it discussed pros and cons in every way that was possible, and it was only when it was found that the difficulties of registration proper such as had been thought of by a large number of members of the Institute were so great as to be almost insuperable, that they issued that Interim Report to the Council, asking them to consider the matter and to take the opinions of the various Allied Societies as to whether we should go on with a Bill which we were told we should never get, or whether we should adopt some temporary measure which might eventually lead to registration as it is desired by a large number of members, and so get eventually what was wanted. But what have we heard to-night? We have heard that the Licentiates will be made corporate members of the Institute, and that the Associates have been told that they never would be. The proposal of the Council has been of such a nature that if it be carried the Asso-

ciates and the Fellows will be absolutely on equal terms. (Hear, hear.) There will be no distinction for a Fellow above an Associate. I cannot think so lowly of the Associates' interest in this Institute that if we admit the Licentiates into membership here they will oppose this motion on that account. I do not believe it. As Sir Aston Webb has told you, if you get registration you will have to enroll not only the Licentiates but everybody else, whatever his qualifications, whatever his non-qualifications, as an architect. (Hear, hear.) And that this proposal of the Council should be negatived simply because you are proposing to give the Licentiates now what they would certainly get under the other scheme seems to me a most retrograde movement. ("No, no.") I have no axe to grind, I am getting to a time of life when whether architects are registered or not will be very immaterial to me, but I do think that in view of the experience of the Chartered Accountants the suggestion that there will be no value in the title of Chartered Architect is not valid, and that if we get this thing through, the end of our difficulties will be in sight. Nobody wants to rush it through or to advocate it without the fullest discussion on every point. Some members present are asking for the details and particulars to enable them to judge of this proposal. The Registration Committee which was appointed by the Council had all these facts before them; but it was only because they were convinced, many of them very strongly against their will, that it would be useless to proceed on those larger lines for registration at once that they suggested to the Council this compromise which the Council have adopted. By all means adjourn this meeting, by all means let it be fully discussed—(Hear, hear)—but if you are to adopt one of the two alternatives, that is to say, whether we shall go on with the Bill or whether we shall adopt this Resolution of the Council, I have no hesitation in saying that it is in the interests of the Institute, in the interests of all architects and of the public, that we should proceed in the way that this resolution indicates, and should not at present go further. (Applause.)

Mr. W. H. SETH-SMITH [F.]: I think all who know me will admit that I have had something to do with registration, with its initiation and with its promotion, and have always been interested in the course which the movement has taken and in the proposal laid before you to-night. I have not been on this Committee, but I am profoundly impressed by the fact which has been stated to-night—namely, that that Committee is composed of 75 per cent. of convinced registrationists. A fact like that should go a long way to assure this meeting that the best proposal for advancing this interest is that put forward. Registration has been thoroughly considered, and the Council's proposal is laid before you as the best course which we can at the moment take to get a step forward. That movement, I believe, will ultimately result in our getting what we want. But anyone who watches Parliamentary procedure, and who knows the difficulties which face us—as I know, from having gone into this matter and read the first Paper upon the subject twenty-seven years ago—must share the solicitors' opinion that at the present moment it would be almost impossible, if not quite impossible, to get such a Bill as we want through Parliament. And yet I am hopeful that ultimately we shall do so. (Hear, hear.) With regard to what Mr. Hall just said, I regard those difficulties as details, and I think we can trust the Registration Committee and our Council, who are absolutely unbiased, or, I may say, almost biased in favour of this scheme, to get over such difficulties

as he referred to. What we want is a register of qualified men, and I agree with Sir Aston Webb that this Institute is the body to do it. That we laid down as the initial principle when we started this movement, that the Institute should be the sole examining body, if that is possible—(Hear, hear)—and that the Institute should be the registering body. What we want now is in some way to get as near to that ideal as we can. At present we must drop the third general principle which we laid down—namely, that every man calling himself an architect should be a registered architect. We must drop that at present owing to the Parliamentary difficulties and disabilities; but I feel that if we get this Register we shall get a great step forward, and therefore I am heartily in favour of supporting the recommendation of our Council. I do, however, share, Sir, the feelings which have led to the amendment. In looking through, considering, and criticising the proposals laid before us by this Paper to-night, I did feel that, though I trust our Council and Committee very thoroughly, I could not form an opinion properly without the draft amended Bill before me. (Hear, hear.) Also, the full solicitors' advice. (Hear, hear.) And I do think it would be a good thing to adjourn this meeting for the purpose of laying those documents before the whole body. (Applause.) I think if we can get this proposal of a further Charter through, as long as we do not thereby debar ourselves from future action in favour of a Bill, we shall get what we want. (Applause; and cries of "Vote, vote.")

Mr. LEONARD STOKES, *Past President*: I should just like to say that during the time I was honoured by being your President, we had, of course, to consider what was best to be done in this matter. Our first idea was to proceed by way of a Charter, as is now proposed by the Council, as we were told we should never get a Bill through. But we felt we had no choice, as we had the mandate of the Institute to prepare a Bill, and we had to go on with it. Further, we felt we could not get on with the Bill unless we "squared" the Society of Architects. The Institute, however, would not have the Society, and so the Bill had, of necessity, to be dropped. There is an adage which says half a loaf is better than no bread. The present proposals of the Council seem to me to be an attempt to get half a loaf, and, as Sir Aston Webb says, we shall go forward with a likelihood of success; and as there is no chance of getting a Bill at present, what is the use of bumping our heads against a brick wall? It is better to proceed by Charter and get what we can under a new Charter. When we get more powerful, and Parliament has less to do, then we may get all we want.

Mr. JAMES S. GIBSON [F.]: I did not want to intervene in this debate, because I have a vivid recollection of leading a forlorn hope almost two years ago when this subject was thrashed out. But I have every sympathy with the amendment in this sense, that we all wish the subject shall be thoroughly discussed; we do not wish any information to be withheld from members who desire to use that information for the purpose of coming to a decision. It is evident we cannot possibly come to any definite conclusion to-night. (Hear, hear.) But before we part, in addition to the fact that we must meet again and discuss it, and that we may have other information put before us, I would like to suggest, as several legal points have cropped up in this discussion—they always do crop up in a technical matter of this sort—I throw out the suggestion that it would be advisable that we should have our legal advisers here, so that any point which is debatable may

receive a decision straight away. (Applause.) We may not think we are competent or clever architects, but we are sure we are excellent lawyers—(laughter)—though I doubt my own abilities in both spheres. (Laughter.) But whatever my opinion may be worth, you are going to have it. It seems a very curious thing to me, in thinking over this subject, that practically registration was started, if I might say so, by the younger members of the profession and the influence of the provincial members. And they made out a very strong case, and for years the younger members of the profession were devoting the whole of their energies to trying to convert the older members into their way of looking at this particular subject. And now, strange to relate, in 1913 we have come round to the fact that the older members of the profession are quite whole-heartedly in favour of opening the doors of the Institute as widely as possible, and going as far as it is humanly practicable to do, for the first time, to secure a step towards registration, and the younger members are putting up the biggest fight possible to prevent it. One of the best things said by Mr. Peach is the thing we want to keep in mind. This great question is not going to be of any vital value to us who are practising to-day, and we have got to look at it from the point of view, first, what is it going to do for architecture, and, if you like, what in the future is it going to do for architects? I venture to think, if you carefully read through the Report of the Council, and very carefully consider the recommendations, you must honestly come to the conclusion that, barring some details, upon which there must be some diversity of opinion, but all of which can be reconciled by further discussion—barring these practically immaterial things, the whole of these proposals are perfectly logical steps in the direction of carrying through the whole programme of registration. (Hear, hear.) And I honestly do believe that there is no other way in which we have any hope whatever of seeing even partial realisation. If I might throw out a suggestion to the mover of the amendment, it is this: not to press the amendment for a definite postponement of this debate until a certain date for the purpose of supplying information, all of which, I am perfectly certain, is available to any member who wishes to take it, nor to throw upon the Institute the cost of printing all this matter and sending it out over the country to some 2,500 members, a very small proportion of whom can possibly come to this room and express their views. And, after all, it is only the views of members who take trouble, and put themselves to the expense of coming here, which are heard, and who have the opportunity of voting. Let those who really want this information come to the office and get it ("No, no") and study it; that is a perfectly sensible thing to do. It is not asking too much to say to them, "Come here and get the information, and don't make the Institute go to this expense and trouble in sending out a lot of stuff which will be put into the waste-paper basket." To get back to my point, instead of this amendment definitely postponing the meeting until another date, may I throw out the suggestion to the mover and seconder of the amendment that this meeting could very well express an opinion, even to-night, as to its approval of the general lines of policy laid down in this Report? It could, in addition, resolve itself into a meeting or conference to discuss details from time to time, at meetings which would be properly called and held. At such meetings the information which some are asking for could be read out by the Secretary. And I think, in addition, the legal advisers to the Institute should be here, and then we could get through the whole business.

MR. TOPLEY: I have spent five days trying to understand this Report, and I am not going to spend five days at the Institute offices. Mr. Gibson says we should not go to the expense of sending out the information to all the members, but the meeting must realise that the Institute has reached a crisis in its career. ("True.") This is a time which justifies expenditure. I have moved this amendment after considerable thought. I think it is a sound one and leads to a proper conclusion.

MR. JOHN BROOKE [F.]: May I suggest that it might meet the difficulty and save expense if it were understood that copies should be sent to each of the Allied Societies, with permission to use it, so that copies could be seen at headquarters?

MR. PEACH: They have got it.

MR. BROOKE: It was sent as private and confidential. But if it were sent as I suggest, any member in the provinces who wished to do so could see it.

MR. BRODIE: I think it would be reasonable if half a dozen typewritten copies of this information were available for people who wished to have them. I have been shown to-night, in this room, a circular issued by a body of Associates who have been holding meetings and have evolved this resolution, and they should certainly be given a copy of this information, a comparatively inexpensive copy, without going to the extraordinary expense of sending a copy to every member of the Institute, which copy, as Mr. Gibson says, would certainly go into the waste-paper basket.

SIR ASTON WEBB: I move that this meeting be now adjourned, and I am sure that in the time which elapses between this meeting and the next, the Council will consider it, and supply all the information they consider necessary for this meeting to form a just decision upon the matter. We can then discuss the subject again after the full information is forthcoming which we leave it to the Council to provide.

MR. HALL: If any member desires to have a copy of the information he could have it, I suppose; and then Mr. Brooke's suggestion that the Allied Societies should be allowed to use their copies for their members could be carried out, and at the next meeting we might get it through.

MR. STOKES: A good deal of the information I suggest might be given in our Journal.

THE PRESIDENT: Instructions shall be given for that to be done in the next issue. There is no idea of withholding a scrap of information. The Council are anxious that members shall have the opportunity of discussing this matter very thoroughly.

The motion for adjournment was then put and carried.

## CORRESPONDENCE.

### Registration.

54 Bedford Square, W.C. : 3rd December 1913.

To the Editor, JOURNAL R.I.B.A.—

SIR.—I am not a Member of the Council or of the Registration Committee, but, as a result of the discussion on the 1st instant, I venture to suggest, entirely on my own responsibility, that if the Council could see its way at the next Special General Meeting to bring forward, after due notice, a revision of its proposals on the following lines, there is, it seems to me, every reason to think that the Institute would adopt it.

(1) That all Fellows, Associates, and Licentiates of the R.I.B.A.; all members of any Allied Society whom the Council of that Society shall certify are engaged in the *bona fide* practice of architecture; all members of the Society of Architects who shall be similarly certified; all architectural members of the Royal Academies of England, Scotland, Ireland, and Wales; all graduates in architecture of the United Kingdom; all other architects who have been in practice eighteen years; and all persons who, after the granting of this Charter, shall have been examined and duly passed by the Council of the R.I.B.A., shall have the exclusive right to use the distinctive title of "Chartered Architect."

(2) That the Royal Institute shall be empowered to form and maintain a register of all persons entitled to use the title of "Chartered Architect."

(3) That, subject to By-laws for the time being, the Council of the R.I.B.A. shall formulate, and from time to time alter and amend a scheme of examinations to be held to qualify for the title of "Chartered Architect," and to appoint Examiners for the conduct of such examinations; to pay the Examiners such fees as the Privy Council may approve; to fix the fees payable by candidates for such examinations, and, subject to the approval of the Privy Council, to alter such fees from time to time.

(4) That the Council of the R.I.B.A. shall be composed as follows:—

(a) The Fellows of the R.I.B.A. shall be represented by 21 Fellows:

(b) The Associates shall be represented by 10 Associates:

(c) The Licentiates shall be represented by 5 Fellows of the Institute who shall have passed to that rank by examination from the Class of Licentiates, such representatives to be annually elected by the whole body of Licentiates;

(d) The Society of Architects shall be represented by two of its members, one of whom shall be the President of that Society, and both of whom shall be Fellows of the R.I.B.A.;

(e) The Allied Societies shall be represented by their Presidents as at present;

(f) The Architectural Association shall be represented by its President, who shall be a Fellow or Associate;

(g) The four Standing Committees of the Institute shall be represented by the Chairman of each, *ex-officio*, who shall be a Fellow;

(h) The Board of Education shall be similarly represented by its Chairman, *ex-officio*.

(5) That the R.I.B.A. shall be empowered subject to the approval of the Privy Council to issue a scale of fees payable to Chartered Architects.

(6) That the R.I.B.A. shall be able and capable in law, notwithstanding the Statute of Mortmain, to receive, purchase, possess, hold and enjoy to them

and their successors a Hall and any messuages, lands, tenements or hereditaments whatsoever, the yearly value of which, including the site of the said Hall, shall not exceed the sum of £5,000 per annum.

That subject to the provisions contained in this Charter, the existing Charters shall, so far as un-repealed or varied, have full effect and validity and be confirmed accordingly.

By this scheme it will be seen that while the purview of the Institute is broadened in a manner commensurate with its greater responsibilities (a) the constitution of the Institute remains unaltered; (b) the principle that only corporate Members shall sit on its Council is maintained; (c) the Educational basis of Membership is not affected; (d) the class of Licentiates is represented by its own nominees in the management of affairs; and (e) all Societies of Architects, whose numerical strength is considerable, have a voice in the direction and control by the central Council of all matters pertaining to architecture and to architects on the Register.

I hold—and always held while I was in office—that it is the duty of the Council to endeavour to give effect to the Resolution of March 1907 in favour of applying to Parliament for Statutory Registration as soon as practicable. I believe it has tried to do so, and I note the Council has anew given its assurance that that Resolution shall in no way be prejudiced by the adoption of any present proposals, but shall be put into force at a time when Parliamentary business affords a prospect of success. That being so, it has recommended as an intermediate step the application for a new Charter; and, personally, as one who has been long and intimately connected with the progress of the Institute, I think it is wise to follow that advice, always provided that the Charter is drafted with jealous regard to the rights of all parties and with a statesmanlike outlook to the future.

Apologising for the length of this letter, I am, Sir, your obedient servant,

EDWIN T. HALL [F.]

#### London Hospital Essay Prize.

The College Board of the London Hospital offer a prize of the value of £120 for the best essay on "The Ventilation of Schools and Public Institutions." The essay, set under the will of the late Dr. John Liddle, is to be typewritten or printed, in English, and delivered at the London Hospital not later than 31st May 1914. The number and importance of original observations will be considered principal points of excellence. Full particulars may be obtained from the Dean, the London Hospital Medical College, Mile End, E.



9 CONDUIT STREET, LONDON, W., 6th December 1913.

#### NOTICE TO LICENTIATES.

The Council desire to call the attention of Licentiates to the fact that in their Form of Declaration they undertook to use no other affix than "Licentiate R.I.B.A." after their names. Any breach of this regulation would compel the Council to put in force the penalty prescribed in By-law 24.

IAN MACALISTER, *Secretary.*

#### CHRONICLE

##### The Revised Scale of Charges.

The adjourned Special General Meeting, summoned for the 24th November to resume consideration of the draft revised Schedule of Professional Charges, met the same fate as the previously called Meeting for the same object on the 7th July last, falling through for want of the quorum required under By-law 67, viz.: "at least forty members, of whom at least twenty-one must be Fellows." The Chair was taken at 8 o'clock by Mr. Ernest Newton, A.R.A., Vice-President, but only 17 Fellows and 16 Associates having assembled by 8.30, the business could not proceed, and the Chairman, after an expression of regret to those attending for the useless trouble to which they had been put, declared the Meeting void and left the Chair.

The Council at their Meeting last Monday decided to bring the subject forward again at the Business Meeting to be held on the 12th January.

##### The London Main Roads and Town Planning Conference: Mr. John Burns's Suggestions.

The Conference presided over by Mr. John Burns, President of the Local Government Board, at Caxton Hall on the 25th November, arose out of the deputation from the R.I.B.A. and other bodies which, at the instance of the Institute Council, the Prime Minister received at the House of Commons last July.\* Its purpose was to devise means of bringing about the necessary co-ordination in the making of main arterial roads and the framing of

\* See correspondence with Mr. Asquith and report of proceedings at the deputation, JOURNAL R.I.B.A. 26th July 1913.

town-planning schemes. The Conference was attended by representatives of all the local authorities in Greater London and of the various Societies interested. Sir Aston Webb, R.A., Mr. H. V. Lanchester, Mr. W. H. Seth-Smith, and Mr. W. R. Davidge were present as representatives of the Institute appointed by the Council. The subjoined report is extracted mainly from notes kindly furnished by Mr. W. R. Davidge.

MR. BURNS said that the object of the Conference was to arrange some method by which Greater London traffic could be better served by better roads and more spacious and dignified approaches than those we possessed at present. The subject had been dealt with in the last ten or twelve years by Commissions, Departments, the Traffic Branch of the Board of Trade, the Road Board, and the Local Authorities in a not altogether satisfactory way, acting separately and independently of each other, often ignorant of each other's plans, proposals, and desires, and at times unconsciously hostile to each other. In a general way, unity in idea ought to prevail if only as a means of saving the future from the costly and ugly blunders that isolated action in the past had bequeathed to them to-day. Roads were a costly business to make when new, and they would not cheapen as time went on. But the most extravagant thing was the widening of old roads that had been made too narrow. The chief duty of the Conference was to save the future from much of that avoidable and preventable waste. He did not think that any new Authority for town planning was necessary. His suggestion was that sectional conferences of adjoining authorities, or in groups of six, eight, or ten authorities, should be called by the Local Government Board to consider the alignment of the proposed arterial roads and to agree if possible on some skeleton scheme, for there was no need to construct the roads right away. His own opinion was that it was not so much the cash that was wanted as ideas. Foresight, in this case, was of infinitely more value than money.

SIR ASTON WEBB, who opened the discussion on behalf of the Royal Institute and other professional bodies, emphasised the urgent necessity, not necessarily for a new Authority, but for giving some Central Authority power to deal with the main arterial roads out of London, and to consider the many broader questions which were bound up with the question of the main roads. The suggested District Conferences might be all right in their way, but in the last resort there must be some power to lay down definitely the line on which any particular road should be constructed.

LOD PEEL, Chairman of the L.C.C. Improvements Committee, said that one of the difficulties was that some of the roads required for through traffic were much wider, and therefore more expensive, than was necessary for local needs, and the Local Authority of the district felt it hard that they should have to contribute to their upkeep. The main roads ought to be taken over by the Central Government.

MR. W. H. SETH-SMITH instanced the want of foresight now evidenced in the construction of many new roads, such as the Croydon relief road, and the necessity for a wider view of the subject.

ALDERMAN THOMPSON, of Richmond, said he had a mandate from fifty out of the eighty authorities of Greater London to ask that District Conferences should be called, and the Local Authorities would be glad to have the skilled help of the great Architects'

and Surveyors' Societies, "if," he added, "they will give it for nothing."

"Which they will do," remarked Mr. Burns.

As the discussion proceeded, it became evident that the general opinion was that what was wanted was not a central authority, but a *centralising* authority, a representative authority composed of delegates from all the authorities being clearly too unwieldy. A suggestion was made that a board of experts would be best, that the London Traffic problem and the question of Town Planning in Greater London is one and the same thing, and that a new Government Department should be created for the work. In any case, some assurance was wanted as to the eventual completion of these through communicating roads. If Local Conferences were to be held, it was important that the Government authorities should be included in each conference.

MR. RAYMOND UNWIN emphasized the important point that the Local Conferences, when held, must not be exclusively Road Conferences, but Town Planning Conferences, and should consider the whole question, including possible open spaces, on the lines advocated by the London Society, and also the architectural effect of the whole. There was, too, the possible necessity of compulsion to make Local Authorities take steps to promote a town-planning scheme, and thus secure control over the development of their area. And there was the still further necessity of somebody who could render the decisions of the Local Conferences effective—some final power not only to provide the big ideas but to carry them into effect. A time-limit should be put on the Local Authorities, and they should, if necessary, be made to take action in the matter.

MR. BURNS, in summing up the discussion, said that if the Conference had done nothing better than to bring Ministers and permanent officials of Government Departments to be pilloried together, it had not been without considerable service. He gathered that they were agreed as to local conferences being called: that the Local Government Board should convene these conferences and should draft a general reference on the subject; that an official report of the Conference should be circulated as soon as possible; and finally that he was willing to urge the Local Authorities who had not already prepared town planning schemes to do so. He also urged that the existing central authorities should get together, pending "probable absorption of each by one another" as subsequent circumstances may determine.

#### Exhibition of Architectural Students' Drawings at the Royal Academy.

The drawings done in the Final Competition for the Commissioners' Scholarship in Architecture and the Henry Jarvis Travelling Studentship at the British School at Rome will be exhibited at the Royal Academy from the 19th to the 30th December inclusive. There will be a private view on the 18th December, and the Press will have access on the 17th if the hanging can be completed in time.

On the 11th and 12th December there will be on view at the Royal Academy, from 11 to 4, the premium drawings of the late James M. Whitelaw, Soane Medallist and R.I.B.A. Measured Drawings Medallist, whose promising career was cut short so tragically at Bournemouth last July.

#### St. Paul's Bridge Designs.

At the meeting of the Court of Common Council last week, Mr. J. R. Pakeman, Chairman of the Bridge House Estates Committee, in reply to a question as to what course the Committee proposed to adopt with reference to the architectural treatment of St. Paul's Bridge, stated that it was proposed to invite British architects to send in designs, and in the advertisements premiums would be offered of £300, £200, and £100 to the authors of the designs placed first, second, and third by Sir Wm. Emerson, who would act in conjunction with the Committee as Assessor.

#### Proposed Ministry of Fine Arts.

A Meeting to consider the question of the advisability of forming a Ministry of the Fine Arts was held on the 25th November at 9 Conduit Street, and was attended by Dr. David Murray, in the Chair; Sir George Frampton, R.A.; Mr. W. Reynolds Stephens, Chairman of the Imperial Arts League; Mr. W. R. Colton, R.A.; Sir Frank Short, R.A.; Mr. Arthur Hacker, R.A.; Mr. E. Guy Dawber, Hon. Sec. R.I.B.A.; Professor E. Lanteri; Mr. Solomon J. Solomon, R.A.; Mr. H. V. Lanchester [F.]; Mr. C. Stanley Peach [F.]; Mr. Wynford Dewhurst; Mr. H. W. Wills [F.]; and Mr. Henry T. Hare [F.]. After considerable discussion the following resolution was proposed and carried unanimously: "That this Committee undertakes to consider the possible lines on which a Ministry of the Fine Arts might be advantageously formed, and if a satisfactory scheme can be evolved pledges itself to do its best to bring such a scheme into operation."

#### Anglo-American Exposition, Shepherd's Bush, 1914.

This exhibition is to celebrate the centenary of peace and progress in the arts, sciences, and industries of the United States of America and the British Empire. The Duke of Connaught is Patron, the Duke of Teck Hon. President, and Earl Curzon, Earl Grey, Lord Rothschild, Lord Strathcona, The Lord Mayor, Mr. James Bryce, Sir Edward Poynter, and others, Vice-Presidents. A large section will be devoted to the decorative arts, including decorations and fixed furniture, paper-hangings and wall-coverings, carpets, silks, tapestries, and fabrics for upholstery and upholsterers' decorations, ceramics (pottery and porcelain), and glass (crystal and stained glass). The British Executive Committee, under the chairmanship of the Earl of Kintore, is desirous of bringing to the notice of those interested in British industries the necessity of their being adequately represented at the exhibition where the Americans are preparing to make a fine display. The Hon. Secretary of the Decorative Arts Committee is Mr. Arthur S. Jennings, Editor of *The Decorator*.

## OBITUARY.

**Charles Babcock**, of Ithaca, N.Y., Professor Emeritus of Architecture in Cornell University, and the last surviving founder of the American Institute of Architects, who died on the 27th August last in his eighty-fifth year, had been an Hon. Corresponding Member of the Institute since 1892. Professor Babcock was a graduate of Union College, and studied architecture under Richard Upjohn. He afterwards entered into partnership with Mr. Upjohn, and married his daughter. It was in 1857 that he, with a number of other young architects in New York City, effected the organisation of the American Institute of Architects with an initial membership of thirty members. Soon afterwards he retired from practice, took orders in the Episcopal Church, and was rector of the church at Greenwood Iron Works, N.Y., from 1863 to 1871, when he was appointed to the then newly-established chair of Architecture at Cornell University. In 1896 the department of Architecture at the University was made a fully organised college, with Professor Babcock as its first dean and director. He was then approaching his seventieth year, and his physical resources beginning to fail, he retired in 1897, yielding his position to one of his own pupils. After his return to the ranks of the profession in 1871 as a teacher, the pressure of his special duties precluded his undertaking many or large commissions, but he rendered valuable service to the profession as consulting or advisory architect, and he continued to hold the position of advisory architect to the University until his death.

**George Browne Post**, the distinguished American architect and Past President of the American Institute of Architects, whose decease is announced at the age of seventy-six, was elected Hon. Corresponding Member R.I.B.A. in 1907. Mr. Post was educated as an engineer in the University of the City of New York, and on quitting the University in 1858 he entered the atelier of Richard Morris Hunt, which had just been established. Mr. Post's work has been classified into four principal divisions as to time and style—first, his engineering period, represented by the Pulitzer Building, Park Row, New York; secondly, his experimental period, when he built the Produce Exchange Building at Bowling Green, the old *Times* building in Park Row, &c.; thirdly, his period of development, represented by the Cornelius Vanderbilt town house, the Liberal Arts Building at the Columbian Exposition, the Park Building at Pittsburgh, &c.; and fourthly, his period of achievement, beginning perhaps with the successful competition design for the Department of Justice at Washington about fourteen years ago. He was the architect of the interesting group of buildings erected soon afterwards for the College of the City of New York. Later buildings are the New York Stock Exchange, the Mutual Benefit

Life Insurance Building, the George Washington University, the Capitol building for the State of Wisconsin, &c. Mr. Post was the author also of the fine piece of city planning for the improvements of the harbour of Newport, Rhode Island. In his later years Mr. Post had been assisted in his work by his two sons and partners, Messrs. Wm. S. Post and James Otis Post.

## THE EXAMINATIONS.

## Final Examination: Testimonies of Study approved.

The Board of Architectural Education have approved the designs submitted by the under-mentioned Students who are qualifying for the Final Examination:—

## SUBJECT XI.

## (a) DESIGN FOR A COUNTY CLUB.

Craske : C. W.	Adams : P. J.
Davison : W. R.	Andrew : H.
Dyson : V.	Alison : W.
Jepson : H. N.	Fyfe : J. S.
Nisbet : A.	Rose : G. A.
Brown : J. M.	Cooksey : H. T.
Clarke : J. A.	Whitehead : H. M.
Ackroyd : S. W.	

## (b) DESIGN FOR A CLOCK TOWER.

Maxwell : A. E.	Binnie : W. B.
Callender : G. W.	Hooper : A. F.
Burnett : A. S.	Wallace : R. S.
Robinson : N. S.	Philp : R. H.
Silcock : A.	Jenkins : F.
Jenkins : T. T.	Addey : F. A.
Cheek : C. C.	Foot : A. A.
Robertson, Jun. : A. W.	Stoner : A. P.
Shibley : A. R.	Norris : E. B.
Eaton : G. M.	Triscott : H. S.
Wood : A. J.	Glazebrook : F. H.
Musmann : E. B.	Cole : E. R. F.
Terrell : W. E. W.	

## MINUTES. III.

## BUSINESS GENERAL MEETING.

At the Third General Meeting (Business) of the Session 1913-1914, held Monday 1st December 1913, at 8 p.m.—Present, Mr. Reginald Blomfield, A.R.A., President, in the Chair; 59 Fellows (including 20 Members of the Council), and 157 Associates (including 5 members of the Council)—the Minutes of the Meeting held 17th November 1913, having been published in the JOURNAL were taken as read and signed as correct.

The Hon. Secretary announced the decease of the following Hon. Corresponding Members:—Professor Charles Babcock, of New York, elected 1892, and George Browne Post, of New York, elected 1907, and upon the motion of the Hon. Secretary it was resolved that the Meeting do record its sincere regret at the decease of these distinguished men and that a message of sympathy and condolence with the architectural profession in the United States be conveyed to the American Institute of Architects.

The Hon. Secretary announced the presentation of a

number of books to the Library [see *SUPPLEMENT*], and it was resolved that a cordial vote of thanks be passed to the donors.

Herbert Arthur Welch, *Associate*, attending for the first time since his election, was formally admitted by the President.

The following candidates were elected by show of hands under By-law 10:—

As FELLOWS (12).

CROSBIE : Lawrence Stanley [A. 1907].  
HARRINGTON : Harry [A. 1894].

and the following Licentiates, who had passed the qualifying Examination:—

BUTLER : Edmund (Birmingham).  
CROUCH : Joseph (Birmingham).  
DENING : Charles Frederick William (Bristol).  
HOARE : Edward Barclay, B.A.Oxon.  
RICHARDSON : Albert Edward.  
RICHMOND : Ernest Tatham.  
SAVAGE : Rupert (Birmingham).  
THOMAS : Ernest Montagu (Ootacamund, India).  
WHEELER : Montague, M.A.Cantab.  
WILSON : John (Edinburgh).

As ASSOCIATES (32).

ADAMS : Edward [S. 1910] (Oxford).  
BUDDEN : Lionel Bailey, M.A. [*Special*] (Liverpool).  
CROWE : Joseph John [S. 1905].  
ELLIS : T. Gordon [S. 1910] (Johannesburg).  
FRASER : Henry Hubert [*Pugin Student* 1910, *Student* 1907].  
GRISSELL : Francis [S. 1907].  
HAMMOND : Frederick Millett [*Special*] (Bradford).  
HANDS : Joseph Garnet [S. 1909].  
HEBBLETHWAITE : Bernard Robinson [S. 1909].  
HENDRY : Harry Duncan [S. 1909].  
HILL : Joseph [S. 1909].  
KAY : George Alexander [S. 1907] (Derby).  
LAWSON : John Boyd [S. 1910].  
LINTON : Leonard [S. 1908] (Stockton-on-Tees).  
LORNE : Francis [S. 1911].  
MACKENZIE : Gilbert Marshall, B.A.Cantab. [S. 1912].  
MARCH : John Ewart [S. 1911] (Axbridge).  
MAYHEW : Alfred Ernest [S. 1910].  
NIMMO : William Wilson [S. 1908].  
PEERLESS : Herbert Read [S. 1910].  
PHILLIPS : Aubrey Wyndham [S. 1912] (Swansea).  
PONDER : Claud Vincent [S. 1905].  
ROGERS : John Charles [S. 1912].  
RUSHWORTH : Tom Sadler [S. 1905].  
SPENCER : Thomas [S. 1907].  
STURGEON : Robert Victor [S. 1909] (Manchester).  
TAIT : Thomas Smith [*Special*].  
TEMPLE : Eric Edward [S. 1907] (Montreal, Canada).  
VOELKEL : William [S. 1909] (Newcastle-on-Tyne).  
WALKER : Richard, B.A.Oxon. [S. 1910].  
WILKS : John [S. 1909] (South Shields).  
WOOD : Herbert McGregor [S. 1908].

As HON. ASSOCIATES (2).

ETCHELLS : Ernest Fiander; F.Phys.Soc., M.Math.A., A.M.I.Mech.E.  
FOX : Sir Francis, J.P., M.Inst.C.E.

As HON. FELLOW.

The Right Hon. REGINALD BALIOL BRETT, Viscount ESHER, G.C.V.O.

The Secretary announced that the following gentlemen had been reinstated as Associates of the Royal

Institute—viz. Alfred Hale (Birmingham) and Henry Edward Woodsend (Nottingham).

On the motion of the President, seconded by Mr. Wm. Woodward, Chairman of the Finance Committee, it was

RESOLVED, that pending the registration under the Land Transfer Acts of the title of the Institute to the freehold and leasehold properties now vested in the Architectural Union Company, Limited, or in the Liquidator thereof, the Council of the Institute be authorised to join with the said Liquidator or otherwise in giving to the present Mortgagees such security for the sum of £4,000 owing to them as they shall reasonably require. And on the said Liquidator transferring the said properties to the Institute, the Council be authorised to execute in favour of the present Mortgagees such Mortgage as the Council shall think fit to secure the repayment of the said sum of £4,000 with interest at the rate of 4 per cent. per annum in substitution for the said existing Mortgage.

And that the Council be authorised to execute a second charge over the said properties in favour of the Bankers of the Institute as security or part security for the Overdraft authorised by the Resolution passed and confirmed on the 13th day of March 1911 and the 27th day of March 1911.

The Business Meeting then terminated.

SPECIAL GENERAL MEETING.

At a Special General Meeting summoned by the Council under By-law 65, and held on Monday, 1st December 1913, following the Business General Meeting above recorded, and similarly constituted, the President, having briefly traced the history of the movement for the Statutory Registration of Architects, formally presented for consideration the Report and Recommendations of the Council in regard to the question.

Mr. C. Stanley Peach [F.] moved, and Mr. K. Gammell [A.] seconded, the adoption of the Report and Recommendations.

Mr. S. Douglas Topley [A.] moved and Mr. Herbert A. Welch seconded the following amendment:—

"That in the opinion of this Meeting of the R.I.B.A. it is undesirable to come to any decision in regard to the report and recommendations of the Council without further information; and, in order to arrive at some definite policy in regard to future action, a further Meeting should be called before the end of January next for the purposes suggested by the Registration Committee in Clause 5 of the Report of the 28th March 1913, and that with the notice of that Meeting every Member should receive from the offices of the Institute:

- (a) A copy of the Bill as revised.
- (b) Copies of the reports of the Solicitors and Parliamentary Agents, and
- (c) Copies of the whole of the documentary evidence upon which these reports were based.

In the discussion which ensued the following Members took part, viz.: Messrs. Edwin T. Hall [F.], Sir Aston Webb, R.A. [F.], G. A. T. Middleton [A.], John Slater [F.], W. H. Seth-Smith [F.], Leonard Stokes [F.], James S. Gibson [F.], John Brooke [F.], and C. H. Brodie [F.].

A motion for the adjournment of the Meeting having been made by Sir Aston Webb, and the President having undertaken that Members should be furnished with all the information desired, the motion was put to the Meeting and carried. The proceedings then closed, and the Meeting separated at 10.35.

